


JPRS-UPA-89-006
25 JANUARY 1989



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report



Soviet Union

Political Affairs

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

19980202 171

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-89-006

CONTENTS

25 JANUARY 1989

PARTY, STATE AFFAIRS

30 Oct Minsk Demonstration Profiled	1
Baltic National Front Influence Deplored [<i>SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA</i> , 16 Nov 88]	1
SupSov Resolution [<i>G. Tarazevich, L. Syroyegina; SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA</i> , 17 Nov 88]	3
SupSov Presidium Chairman Speaks	
[<i>Ye. Gorelik, A. Pryanishnikov; SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA</i> , 18 Nov 88]	4
Chuvash Obkom Secretary Defends Restructuring Efforts	
[<i>A. Leontyev; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA</i> , 6 Dec 88]	9

MEDIA, PROPAGANDA

Leningrad TV Quality Praised As Glasnost Vanguard	
[<i>D. Yefremov, A. Vasilyev; MOSCOW NEWS</i> No 49, 11-18 Dec 88]	11
Soviet Press Coverage of Baltic Political Events Faulted	
[<i>V. Marsov; MOSCOW NEWS</i> No 48, 4-11 Dec 88]	12

HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY

Stalin's Interpreter on 1949 Talks With Mao Zedong [<i>N.T. Fedorenko; PRAVDA</i> , 23 Oct 88]	15
Readers Favorably Assess Stalin, Criticize Gorbachev [<i>M. Lysenko; SILSKI VISTI</i> , 19 Nov 88]	22

CULTURE

Markov Defends State Prizes in Literature, Arts [<i>G. Markov; PRAVDA</i> , 16 Nov 88]	25
Uzbek Editor On Literary Scene Under Stalin, Rashidov	
[<i>N. Khodzhayev; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA</i> No 45, 9 Nov 88]	27

SOCIAL ISSUES

Legal Expert Defends Proposed Curbs on Capital Punishment	
[<i>G. Orlovskiy; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA</i> , 24 Dec 88]	30
Chief of UkSSR CP CC Civil Law Department Interviewed	
[<i>A. Kraslyanskyy; RADYANSKA UKRAYINA</i> , 10 Nov 88]	31
Criminal Investigator Describes Fight Against Organized Crime	
[<i>Yu Popov; SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH</i> , 4 Oct 88]	34
Latvian Internal Affairs Minister Examines History of CID	
[<i>V. Vilks; SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA</i> , 5 Oct 88]	36
Uzbek Supreme Court Admits Mistakes; Promises Reforms	
[<i>P. Khabibullayev, L. Bekkulbekova; PRAVDA VOSTOKA</i> , 21 Nov 88]	39
Readers Blast Leadership of 'Pamyat', 'Democratic Union'	
[<i>Yu. Kazarin, A. Russovskiy; VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA</i> , 23 Nov 88]	41

REGIONAL ISSUES

Belorussian Unofficial Clubs Deplored	44
Talaka's Platform Vilified	
[<i>N. Dorozhkin, A. Bardanov et al.; SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA</i> , 22 Oct 88]	44
Clubs Viewed as Obstructing Perestroika	
[<i>V. Levin, B. Tarasevich; SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA</i> , 27 Oct 88]	49
Latvian Front Organizations Discussed	51
Popular Front Officials' Salaries [<i>O. Avdevich; SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH</i> , 2 Nov 88]	51
Kezbers Addresses Plenum of Creative Unions [<i>SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA</i> , 4 Nov 88]	52
Reader Defends Interfront From Critics [<i>A. Fedoseyev; SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA</i> , 5 Nov 88]	53

Helsinki-86 Leader Accused of 'Working for Foreign Countries'	
[K. Pakaln; SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 16 Nov 88]	54
Editorial Criticizes Call for Republic Sovereignty [SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 11 Oct 88]	57
LiSSR Plenum Resolution on Restructuring Primary Party Organizations	
[SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 16 Oct 88]	58
Official Report on 28 Sep Demonstrations Issued [SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 18 Oct 88]	60
Khmelnitskiy Citizens Issued Gas Masks to Counter Air Pollution	
[N. Barsegov; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 15 Nov 88]	61
Limnology Institute Director on Lake Baykal Pollution Issues	
[Yu. Makartsev; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 17 Nov 88]	62

30 Oct Minsk Demonstration Profiled

Baltic National Front Influence Deplored
18000229a Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA
in Russian 16 Nov 88 p 4

[Editorial: "In Words and in Deeds"]

[Text] Yesterday the conclusions of the BSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium commission were published; the commission has investigated the causes of the ban on, and then the halting of, the rally held in Minsk on 30 October. They do not, I think, require extensive commentary. But I would like to dwell on one thing, and that is: How did this incident become possible at all? Why did someone summon up the civic courage to call the people to flatly ignore the decree of the city authorities? It is not reasonable to ask, what were they trying to achieve, those who—taking advantage of the good will of the people, and their memories of those who had fallen and perished—passed out pamphlets on the Metro, placed them in the mailboxes of the citizens of Minsk, and pasted them up on lampposts; pamphlets calling upon the citizens to gather peacefully at the banned meeting?

How, for example, can one explain this fact? On the eve of that Sunday, at the House of Literature, a meeting took place between the parents and their children who were studying at Belorussian-language schools. Here the papas and mamas were given an invitation by the initiators of the meeting to attend the measures which the gorispolkom...had banned. But you see, those who consciously urged the people on to possible confrontation with the militia knew full well of this ban. What is this? Political immaturity, or a naked challenge? Ignoring for the sake of personal and group ambitions the existing realities and rules?

And how in this case can one conceive of the realization of one of the principal tenets of a legal state: mutual respect for the law by the representatives of the authorities and by every citizen?

The authors of the articles on the events of that Sunday, writing in LIM and CHYRVONAYA ZMENA, affirm that they were written in full agreement with the program of the new social formation, "Martirolog Belorussii" [The Martyrology of Belorussia]. The tasks and goals which they have proclaimed are truly sacred for any honest citizen: "To preserve forever the memory of the sons of the Belorussian people, who were tormented in Stalin's torture chambers or shot at places of mass execution; who perished from labor beyond their strength, from hunger, from cold and from sickness..."

If one wishes to be objective, then one must properly say that even before the creation of "Martirolog" quite a lot had been done in the republic in this direction, and is still being done. Thousands of innocently condemned and repressed people have been rehabilitated in accordance with civil and party procedure: party and state

leaders, economic and military cadres, scientists, literary and artistic figures, workers and peasants, communists and non-party members. A great deal has been said in the press, from the TV screen, and on radio about the many magnificent sons and daughters of the Belorussian people whose names and good deeds have been undeservedly kept silent for many years.

A Belorussian CP Central Committee Buro commission has been set up and is in operation, for additional study of materials connected with the repressions which took place in the period of the 1930's, the 1940's and the early 1950's. The commission, together with social organizations and the legal organs, is making an in-depth study of questions of rehabilitation of those innocent persons who had suffered, and is preparing proposals on questions associated with perpetuating the memory of and the places of burial for of the victims of repression, and specifically at Kuropaty.

The conditions have been prepared for a soon-to-be-announced competition for establishing a monument to the victims of Stalin's terror. Account number 700454 has been opened at USSR Zhilsotsbank to which any citizen can send his voluntary contribution for that monument.

One would think that as they were preparing for what was in essence the first activity of their society, the activists of "Martirolog" might have given more thought to its substance, and might have tried to tie it in with the measures already being taken in this direction. Perhaps it was not worthwhile calling excessive attention to the meeting, but to carefully prepare, in detail, a solemn memorial ceremony, and conduct it not only at Moscow Cemetery, but at the memorial cemetery on Kozlov St. as well—where, incidentally, the remains of Ya. Kupala and Ya. Kolas and other famous people rest as well. Where next to the granite tombstones, there lie in long ranks the modest headstones of the soldiers who gave their lives in the liberation of Minsk. And during the solemn rituals on Memorial Day, we must not forget the graves of the internationalist troops and the communal graves on Tolbukhin Blvd, at the Masyukovshchina and in Trostenets.

But by all accounts, the organizers of the procession just had to have a meeting, and needed an audience of many thousands. One can only guess how they would have appealed to the people; but one cannot but prick up one's ears at the nature and the content of the statements which were confiscated and the slogans shouted by certain demonstrators, which were of a demagogic, anti-national nature. And there was not one call to hold sacred the memory of the fallen.

Yes, we are all learning democracy today. That's splendid, and it is necessary; but it is also very difficult. Because we do not have any rules, nor any traditions. But, to put it bluntly, neither is there anyone who especially wants to comprehend this difficult science.

With some of our fellow-citizens, it seems to us, they are always in a ring, in a discussion—and that is in no way different from the single combat of boxers, in which there can be only one victor; and therefore, to end the match, he thirsts for the inevitable knock-out.

But would it not be fine if both parties in the dispute would win, having sought out and extolled the truth, finding specific answers to the questions: What must be done today, and tomorrow, in order for the renewal of our life to flow more smoothly, and that the changes for the better in it would become more noteworthy and weighty every day.

There is nothing more dangerous in social life than obstructionism, one-sidedness of views on this or that complex problem. Especially if they are connected with persistent efforts to foist off one's own passions, and with implacable denial of everything that does not fit into one's own perceptions. For this reason, it seems useful to us to recall the very cogent lines from the PRAVDA article of April, "The Principles of Perestroika: Revolutionary Thinking and Actions": "In this complex situation, it is necessary to make a clear-cut distinction of where there is real discussion, genuine concern for the actual problems, and a search for the best answers and solutions; and where there is the desire to turn democratization and glasnost against democratization and glasnost themselves, and against perestroika."

There began to appear in the mailboxes of the citizens of Minsk and on telegraph poles, "Adozva Arganizatsyynaga kamitetu Belaruskaga narodnaga frontu za perebudovu 'Adradzhenne'." These pamphlets laid out the basic theses, in accordance with which it was proposed, evidently, to structure all the activities of the new formation. Cited were many indisputably urgent problems of the restructuring of the economic and spiritual life of the republic—on which party organizations and labor collectives are already working steadfastly: They were described in detail at the recent Belorussian CP Central Committee Plenum, and they will also be the topic of discussion at the next session of the BSSR Supreme Soviet, which opens this week.

And although today no one denies the necessity for the very widest movement in the support of perestroika, one cannot but be on one's guard against the persistence with which the ideas of the creation of the "Popular Front" itself are introduced to the minds of the people. Speaking out recently in the republic press, N. Gilevich, first secretary of the board of the BSSR Writers' Society spoke of this as follows: "This word-combination brings to mind in many people ideas of confrontation, of the gathering of forces against someone or something. A popular movement must be 'for' everything that was proclaimed at the 27th Party Congress and the 19th All-Union Party Conference, and which it will be necessary for us to implement."

And certain people in our republic make no secret of the fact that they intend to copy the Baltic variant, with all its controversial and negative aspects—unfortunately, giving no thought to the fact that the tidings from our neighbors are not all glad.

Along with statements on support of supporting the party's policy of perestroika, the remarks of a number of the leaders of the "unofficial" organizations currently contain increasingly obvious watered-down interpretations of "perestroika," as some kind of abstract humanistic slogan for a social movement. And political changes are inserted into these ideas, which express as a rule not the interests of the entire nation, but the ambitions of a certain group of people. One cannot, of course, remain indifferent toward this situation.

Behind a facade of general discussion about the need for true sovereignty for the national republics, in fact certain "front" leaders are openly tending toward economic and political isolation. Such actions, whether they want it or not, will lead to destabilization of international relations.

Sufficient time has elapsed, and a good deal of facts have been accumulated, to permit making judgments as to whether the programmed declarations correspond with specific matters, with previous contention of appeals and slogans on the actual current positions which they have taken up in the political life of their republic. One of the leaders of the Popular Front of Estonia, who is the head of its program committee, chief editor of the magazine VIKERNAAR R. Veydemann, for example, writes: "No one denies any more that we are the victims of administrative socialism, that we live in an occupied land, that there is no democracy on this land." Here, as we can see, all the accents have already been put in place, without a grimace—that Estonia is an occupied territory; that there is no democracy in it; and that all Estonians are "victims of administrative socialism." Incidentally, the man who is preaching these views pretends to be an ideologist and a theoretician on the movement for perestroika!

To reiterate, we are discussing in such detail certain aspects of the current activities of the popular fronts in our neighboring republics, because the activists in certain of our spontaneous groups, in their public statements and by their deeds are stressing their open sympathy toward them. And it was namely upon their invitation that groups of extremist-oriented persons from certain Baltic republics and from Moscow had come to the unsanctioned meeting.

Under no circumstances should we identify the provocative actions of these and certain other groups, with the aspirations of the peoples of our fraternal republics, with whom we are connected by historical bonds of friendship, by our joint struggle for freedom and happiness, and by the closest possible economic and cultural ties.

But since such instances have occurred, then we should know about them, and we must wage a joint struggle with them, so that no one will ever be able to cast even a shadow of a doubt on the friendship among our fraternal neighbors.

It's a shame, that blind allegiance can interfere with critical analysis of the new social phenomenon, an allegiance which does not allow one to see in them their obvious defects as well as their positive aspects, or even entertain doubts about the end results of their goal.

Here are some current facts about life in our republic. Many farms and enterprises have begun to receive letters from natives of Belorussia working in the neighboring republics, requesting assistance in moving and finding a job.

In its 5 November issue, the Voronovskiy Rayon newspaper, LENINSKOYE ZNAMYA, published the story of V. Pushnenkov, an instructor at the local SPTU, about the activities which people have undertaken in the village of Pelesa, where there are many Lithuanian families and visitors from Vilnius. They are openly trying to introduce their own procedures in the school, are trying to "place" teacher cadres according to their will, and are calling meetings of local residents.

On one of their days off, at a local cemetery, the "guests" secretly built a chapel from materials brought in earlier; and then, with a Lithuanian priest officiating, they organized a prayer service, and flags from the time of bourgeois Lithuania were ostentatiously displayed. Similar news has come from the village of Rimdyuna in Ostrovetskiy Rayon.

And how can one fail to mention the sober, balanced analyses by people "on the sidelines," the foreign communists who had taken part in the congress of the Estonian Popular Front (the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ESTONIA write on this on 11 October 1988). E. Anderson, a correspondent of the Danish newspaper LAND OG FOLK, wrote in his report from Tallinn: "The speeches, although filled with 'perestroika rhetoric,' had nothing in common with the goals and principles of perestroika in fact, but their phraseology was used for speculation on ideas, and for the sake of their own selfish interests." Journalists K. Gustavson from Sweden and V. Pirker from Austria had similar things to say about the discussion at the congress. It is remarkable that even the foreign guests who took the opportunity to express their own opinions about what they had seen and heard, were then and there publicly labeled "Stalinists."

How often, unfortunately, these examples are used among us as well, and not only on the rostrum, but also in the press; when criticism is directed not against the views of one's opponent, at his misconceptions or his errors, but against the person himself. Then they try to strike harder, to knock one off one's feet.

Speaking at a 12 November meeting with Latvian SSR ideological workers, Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee Secretary V.A. Medvedev had this to say in particular: "It will not do for representatives of the press to lose their feeling of responsibility for their words. The time is past when party supervision of the mass information media was accomplished with shouts. But even under pluralism of opinion, the newspapers, magazines and television must show balance and responsibility in their materials...such that this, the most powerful of weapons, would serve only the good; that it would arouse kind thoughts and feelings; that it would encourage good deeds."

Yes, the science of democracy and glasnost still comes hard to us. But comprehend it we must, and the faster the better for the cause, for perestroika, which every day places increasing demands—not for words and declarations, but for specific accomplishments and actions.

It does not serve the cause of perestroika—this flitting about by those people who, to satisfy their own passionate ambitions, and against all common sense, are confusing the people by their precipitate actions, which sow distrust in the party, soviet and economic organs and their leaders; moreover, their endless meetings and disputes are diverting part of the people from creative work.

Party organizations and the true supporters of perestroika must not farm out the work to those who are not in fact its supporters.

At a recent conference at the CPSU Central Committee, the leaders of the mass information media, ideological institutions and creative societies stressed, that "The time has come to take a tighter grip on the practical questions of perestroika, and to move the center of gravity from discussions and debates, from 'meeting-democracy,' to the resolution of specific problems, and to constructive work. If we do not do this, perestroika will incur great losses."

SupSov Resolution

18000229b Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA
in Russian 17 Nov 88 p 3

[BSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Chairman G. Tarazevich and BSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Secretary L. Syroyegina: "Decree of the BSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium": "On the Results of the Study of the Circumstances Associated with the Ban on Holding, and the Halting of, the Meeting in the City of Minsk on 30 October 1988"]

[Text] Having heard the report of the commission formed in accordance with the decree of the BSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium of 4 November 1988 (Comrade Yu.P. Smirnov, reporting), and having examined its conclusions, the BSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium notes that on 3 October 1988, authorized members of the

"Tuteyshyya" Association had appealed to the Tsentralnyy Rayon Ispolkom of the city of Minsk, for permission to hold a meeting on 30 October 1988 in Yanki Kupala Park, in commemoration of "Dzyada" Memorial Day. They were denied permission to hold the meeting, since on that date there were plans to hold Brest Oblast Day at the indicated park, under the auspices of the Third All-Union Native Crafts Festival.

On 18, 19 and 20 October 1988 the initiators of the meeting made similar applications to the Sovetskiy and Pervomayskiy Rayon Ispolkoms and to the Minsk City Ispolkom. The city ispolkom in its decision of 24 October 1988 and the Pervomayskiy and Sovetskiy Rayon ispolkoms in their decisions of 25 October 1988, also denied permission to hold the meeting in connection with the mass measures planned for this time, dedicated to the anniversary of the Komsomol. The organizers of the meeting were notified on a timely basis of the decisions reached.

The leaders of the aforementioned ispolkoms offered no alternative suggestions whatsoever with respect to a date and place for holding the meeting, and thereby did not take advantage of their legal right to do so; nor was the necessary explanatory work with the applicants done following the adoption of the decisions; nor was the appeal on the given question handled in the proper manner at the BSSR Council of Ministers Administration of Affairs.

At the very same time, the organizers of the meeting, although they knew of the decisions of the ispolkoms of the local Soviets, did not submit to them and actually continued active work on further preparations for the meeting. Certain participants in the meeting were trying to utilize it to achieve goals which had nothing in common with the commemorative rites.

The Internal Affairs authorities, having information on the fact that the meeting had been prohibited, and possessing information that certain people nevertheless would conduct it, took measures to protect public order at places where people would probably gather, and to forestall possible excesses.

By authority of the commission, the republic procuracy conducted an examination of the legality of the actions of the militia officials, and found in them no violations whatsoever of existing laws. No complaints were received from citizens at the procuracy of the city of Minsk and the republic on the actions of the internal affairs organs.

The BSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium believes that the undesirable development of the events of 30 October 1988 might have been avoided, if the Soviet organs of the city of Minsk had thoroughly considered and implemented measures of a preventive nature, which would have excluded the possibility of aggravating the situation, and if the organizers and participants in the meeting had shown the proper respect for the law.

The BSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees:

1. To take cognizance of the report of the commission of the BSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on studying the circumstances associated with the ban on holding, and the halting of, the meeting in the city of Minsk on 30 October 1988.

2. To bring to the attention of the Ispolkom of the Minsk City Soviet of People's Deputies, its perfunctory approach to the examination of the question on holding the meeting of 30 October 1988, and its failure to take advantage of its legally-established rights to change the place and time for holding the meeting.

3. To consider that the actions of certain organizers and participants in the meeting, undertaken in spite of the decision of the ispolkoms of the local Soviets, are in conflict with the requirements of the law.

4. The BSSR Council of Ministers is to undertake the necessary work to ensure proper application by ispolkoms of local Soviets of People's Deputies and other state organs of the existing legislation, and the regulations on procedures for organizing and holding gatherings, meetings, street processions, and demonstrations.

5. To propose to the leaders of ministries, departments, labor collectives, creative societies and organizations, and to the ispolkoms of local Soviets of People's Deputies of the Belorussian SSR, that they intensify work on universal education of the populace in the law, and to inculcate in responsible officials and the citizens a respectful attitude toward the law, and toward observing the norms and rules of a socialist commonwealth.

* * *

The Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium appeals to all citizens of the republic to cooperate in every way in expanding and deepening the democratization of social life; to strengthen organizationalism and discipline; to forestall any violations of public order and lawlessness; not to hand over critical problems for spontaneous resolution; and to actively rally all the healthy forces of society under party leadership in support of perestroyka.

SupSov Presidium Chairman Speaks

18000229c Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA
in Russian 18 Nov 88 p 3

[Interview by Ye. Gorelik and A. Pryanishnikov with BSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Chairman Georgiy Stanislavovich Tarazevich: "Only United Will We Be Strong"]

[Text] [Gorelik] The processes taking place of late in social life in the republic have given rise to serious concern among many people. The events which took place on 30

October in Minsk have had wide repercussions. At the same time, in both the mass information media and in public discussion, conflicting opinions are being expressed. And the conclusions of the BSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium commission and official commentaries on them published a few days ago have been received in the same manner. Could you not, Georgiy Stanislavovich, introduce some clarity on these questions?

[Tarazevich] We are only beginning to learn democracy, and in the process of this study we must be able to draw the proper lessons from our mistakes. Of course it is embarrassing and sad that the events of 30 October had to take place in Belorussia; the more so, that they did not have to happen at all. But they did, and therefore it is extremely important to thoroughly analyze not only their consequences, but also to delve into the reasons that the situation arose. And it was precisely this that the Presidium was striving for, in discussing the results of the work of the special commission.

One of the main factors contributing to this incident was the lack, on both sides, of experience in applying the Law on the Procedure for Conducting Meetings and Demonstrations. Both parties approached the problem in a perfunctory manner, and did not try to understand one other. The local authorities did not attribute particular significance to the possible situation, they did not offer any alternative solutions whatever, and someone did not even ensure proper authorization of documents. And the initiators of the meeting, having abandoned attempts to get permission to conduct it by legal means, showing a kind of legal nihilism, in fact held themselves up in contempt of the law. I want to be very careful in my statement on their intentions; however, knowing the subsequent course of events and the nature of the activity of certain people on 30 October, I can permit myself the following thoughts: that some of them, perhaps, did not want anyone's permission, and they had the official ban at hand. I am speaking of this because some people want to stir up passions and emotions, and one must not fail to take notice of this.

And this is why the Presidium deemed it necessary to lay special emphasis in its decree on the role of legal standards and a respectful attitude toward the law, and to appeal to all citizens of the republic to strengthen organizationalism and discipline, and not to hand over critical problems for spontaneous resolution.

In a legal state—and we, after all, took up this subject at the 19th Party Conference—any and all questions must be resolved within the framework of the law. Then why, while giving lip service to unconditional support for the decisions of the conference, do certain representatives of newly-created associations ignore this thesis?

A legal state demands legal standards of all members of society, and the highest degree of responsibility of all persons both for their own deeds and actions, and for the state of affairs as a whole. And this we must also learn.

Why do I say this? Many prestigious and respected people in the republic who knew about the preparations for the meeting, took part in it in spite of its being banned. That means they shared in the idea of the meeting itself. Thus, why did no one make use of the power of their prestige to prevent the young people from taking thoughtless actions; and why did they not try to ensure that the meeting took place on a legal basis? Why did they begin showing their activeness only after the events?

The essential thing is not the reproach, you understand. I recall an article in IZVESTIYA, "A Shortage of Responsibility," which put it very well, saying that to be able to predict the consequences of one's own actions means to possess a sense of historic responsibility, which is absolutely necessary for everyone who takes what is going on seriously, who throws just one single word into the boiling cauldron of today's social life. Perestroika has unfettered our minds, and this is a splendid thing. However, democracy and anarchy are not synonymous. Emotions must be controlled by reason; for perestroika requires consolidation and not demarcation into spheres of influence; for we shall only be strong together.

[Gorelik] Of late many public associations have intensified their activity. This is analyzed in different ways: some categorically refuse to accept the activeness of the "unofficials," and others see them as practically the principal force of perestroika. In connection with this, what is your attitude toward the spontaneous formations, and what role can they play in the process of renewal?

[Tarazevich] In the conditions of democratization and glasnost, the people's initiative has been revealed, along with the desire to take a direct part in the rule of the state, and in the process of renewal itself. Naturally, as a result, new forms of social self-expression are born—clubs, societies, associations. One can only consider this process a positive one.

It is important, of course, that the real goals of these spontaneous formations do not come into conflict with the Constitution and with Soviet laws, and that by their deeds they help carry out revolutionary renewal. Unfortunately, the legal aspects of their activity—for example, the procedure for formation—are not subject to sufficiently clear-cut regulation. One explanation is, that the legislators are simply unable to keep up with the rapid pace of our life. Undoubtedly, the USSR Law on Voluntary Societies, Spontaneous Action, and Spontaneous Social Associations, will provide some clarity. The draft of this law is now in preparation.

I would like to reflect a bit on the following: that any process, any social movement, must be controlled. And here it is reasonable to bring up the USSR Constitution, where the leading and guiding role of our party is clearly and cogently defined. Only in this instance will we be able to create a legal state, and only then will we be able to count on the success of all of our changes.

I repeat, that we are in favor of reasonable movements, for those which operate within the framework of our Constitution and our laws, and within the framework of socialist morality. And everyone must firmly and clearly recognize this.

Nor is it a secret that of late active politization of various groups and associations is under way; groups which began their activity with calls to preserve and multiply the national culture, develop the language, preserve nature, to restore and commemorate the names of those who had been innocent victims of Stalin's repressions. To a certain extent this applies to such associations as "Talaka," "Tuteyshyya," and certain others. And this is natural. The party has not once forbidden further politization of the masses. We are pleased at the activeness of the people. But at the same time, we must strengthen order and discipline and inculcate in everyone respect for the Law and, I would say, obedience to the law as well. But if other principles are followed, we can hardly create a truly democratic legal state.

And I would like to say a few words about this problem: Today, as never before there is need for respectful public dialog. It's much easier, of course, to indiscriminately blame the authorities for all sorts of sins, right down to rejecting the leading and guiding role of the CPSU. Over and over again, they assert that we are surrounded, they say, by bureaucrats, by stupid paper-pushers, a morass of routine... Should one really have to remind them that it was the party itself that started the decisive struggle with these negative phenomena? Once again, many people assert that they want to help the party in perestroyka, and in renewal. But here is how I understand it: to help, means to come and work together, to advance specific matters through joint effort. Prestige, as everyone knows, is won by deeds, by real accomplishments. People are valued primarily for their deeds, and not for abstract declarations and promises.

"Talaka" is a fine word, a Belorussian word. By means of "toloka" the entire community in the village would build houses, and still does. But tell me, can one really build a house—without taking a plane or a trowel in one's hand—merely by appeals to mass labor enthusiasm? Along with the appeals and the slogans, there must be action.

Today one hears left and right that, they say, this or that unofficial group is just about ready to bestow on the people manna from heaven, abundance, spiritual treasures and some kind of privileges. But you see, everyone knows that goods are not created by means of declarations and announcements. The national wealth can be multiplied only by means of the labor of each and every one, by steady and painstaking labor.

What do I see as the role for the spontaneous associations today? I think that they could add the weight of their words to help attract young people to the reform of the economic mechanism, to development of khozraschet and to scientific-technical creativity. These formations could actively

take part in working out and monitoring the implementation of collective agreements, and plans for social development at enterprises. It would be splendid if they could help direct the energies of the young people to developing the national culture, to develop the cooperative movement, to solve the housing problem, and to strengthen the entire social sphere.

Certain of the circles and clubs, along with formulating the political culture and increasing the civic activeness of the young people, could take up the concern of the economic education of the young people, the effectiveness of the study and creative development of Marxism-Leninism, and Soviet social sciences. And here the young people have a right to count on concrete assistance from scholars, specialists on the national economy, the leaders of enterprises, deputies, and propagandists.

It would probably be proper to think about setting up political clubs, in which workers and young people from the country could actively take part. And in all of this, the Komsomol should, of course, play first violin. Here there truly is room for applying the power of the Komsomol organizations, and a real possibility to finally get away from useless work on His Majesty, the report. The Komsomol must overcome that deeply-rooted disease, and embrace everyone and everything. Concrete, thoughtful work with the young people is its primary responsibility to the people. One should not forget that the Communist Youth League is an organization of young communists.

And the seniors should, evidently, reject petty tutelage of their juniors, and get closer to them. Their relationship should be build on the basis of trust, comradeship, mutual demandingness and active interaction in the solution of the complex problems of perestroyka.

[Gorelik] Today the strivings of various kinds of "unofficials" to unite are under especially close scrutiny. They are speaking about a so-called "popular front." What is your analysis of this trend? How should one relate to it?

[Tarazevich] First of all let us determine what stands behind these words. It is hardly the people that stands behind them; more likely, it is individual people; therefore I would use this word very carefully.

In general it is not very modest—to speak on behalf of some kind of name, and not on your own behalf. One must not play on the patriotic and nationalistic feelings of the people, or on their aspirations to multiply their contribution to the coffers of perestroyka. After all, just look what comes of it? There is not yet an organization nor a definite program of action, but the word has already been tossed out, "renaissance." And what, you ask, is there to "renew"? After all, even our enemies are forced to admit, that during the years of Stalin's rule, in spite of the difficulties and the mistakes, our republic

achieved great victories. And it did not achieve them alone, but in the fraternal union of all the Soviet people and with their help. Thus, must all this be struck out?

Those who urge people on today to precipitous actions, who help in stirring up passions and emotions, must cogently and clearly understand, that the principles on which our society is based, and our unity, are unshakable. I did not want to take on the role of a lecturer, but there are four fundamental principles which have been long recognized by the people as irrevocable, and I cannot help but name them: Marxism-Leninism, socialism, the leading role of the party, and the inviolable union of fraternal nations. Departure from these sacred truths, which have passed the severe test of time, and life itself—that is the way that leads to a dead end. The party is in favor of every reasonable initiative directed toward improving and perfecting our system. And it has the right to defend the people against any display directed at the break-up of society, against the Party Program and the Constitution, and against perestroika.

In the course of the discussions going on in the republic today, quite often the problems associated with the development of national culture and the language are brought to the forefront. Of course, one cannot help notice them. Here we have indeed lost a great deal; but we have also done a great deal of late. But you see, their solution is merely one of the many tasks of perestroika. No less complex are the problems of perfecting the economy, accelerating socio-economic development, and raising the standard of living of the workers. Here there is work galore! And everyone, everywhere, can prove his devotion to perestroika in deeds!

A certain amount of movement has been noted in the development of the economy in the republic. There has been noteworthy growth in the rates of industrial production; the economy of kolkhozes and sovkhoses is getting stronger; new methods of management are being actively introduced; and the housing program is being carried out. And nevertheless, in certain sectors there is no progress, and a number of problems have become much worse. One cannot ignore the inflationary processes, the disappearance of inexpensive goods from the assortment, and the lag in the development of the social sphere.

I believe that regional khozraschet, to which the republic is switching over as an experiment, will help a great deal. And here a great deal depends upon the initiative of the working collectives, on their self-discipline, and their businesslike approach. It is necessary for everyone to genuinely feel that he is the master—in the shop or on a collective farm, in a scientific laboratory or in a planning institute. I agree, it is not easy. Just as it is not easy to openly defend one's own point of view in the collective, and not to remain silent when necessary. It is psychologically harder for some people to speak out than to take part in illegal meetings. However, the time has come to switch the center of gravity from "meeting-democracy" to the solution of specific tasks

and to constructive work. And this means that each of us must take more upon himself, analyze his own contribution to the cause of society, and above all to satisfying the needs of our people.

Look, you said, "popular front." But what—is popular rule really not enough for us? We, after all, can—and with complete success—resolve our problems within the framework of the existing system. And if we do not solve something, then it probably is not the authorities who are to blame, but the specific people who are trying to solve it. And we really need to talk about this, and show our activeness here. I have already said this more than once; but I will repeat myself: incidents of recall of deputies in the republic for ineptitude can be counted on the fingers of one hand. And after all, we can and must—both recall a "lazy" deputy, and elect a new ispolkom, if necessary; and put a sneaky bureaucrat in his place. But instead of this the local authorities are sometimes provoked to make a mistake, and then they do not accuse a specific individual, but—indiscriminately—all the authorities, and our entire political system. One should not be thinking about opposing popular rule, but about how to help it better govern the life of society, and how to make it truly popular. After all, if one stops to think about it, each of us must be a part of this rule.

It is pertinent, that it is precisely for this reason that the draft laws now being discussed: the USSR Law on Introducing Amendments and Additions to the USSR Constitution, and on Election of People's Deputies, and the forthcoming reform of the political system. As M.S. Gorbachev stressed in his speech at a gathering in Orel, "This is not simply a redistribution of power, not a lateral movement of positions, and a change of nameplates. Ensuring powerful popular rule—that is the main goal of the political reform." You will agree that without the initiative, without the activeness of the entire nation, and from some group or other out of several; without the concrete participation of everyone in concrete matters, this problem will not be solved.

[Gorelik] Does it not seem to you, that the actions of certain youth associations, which are frequently taken as a challenge to public opinion, or as an attempt to pit themselves against the official authorities—is this not a kind of protest, and at times not a conscious one—against the command-administrative style and various kinds of bureaucratic red tape, without which all of us still frequently encounter?

[Tarazevich] Perhaps. Right now our political system is undergoing a difficult, painful restructuring. A good deal of effort is being applied to search for introduce the most rational means of dividing the functions of the party apparatus and Soviet rule. We must admit that not everything turns out in practice as we would like. Taking its toll are the inertia of thinking, the adherence of many people to outdated work styles and methods, and—the main thing, in my view—the fact that the broad popular masses are not used to taking part in public life and in the governing of the state, not in words but in deeds.

Here I would like to present one of Lenin's ideas: "Thus far we have not achieved the state in which the laboring masses might take part in governing—apart from the law, there is still the cultural level, which no law can fix. This low cultural level dictates that the Soviets, being according to their program organs of government through the workers, are in fact the organs of government for the workers..." And although entire epoch has passed, we, unfortunately cannot say today that this thought of Lenin has lost its cogency. And it turns out that culture alone, even political culture, is not enough: what is needed is not the sum-total of knowledge, but the sum of practical habits. And it is these that most of us lack. During the years of stagnation, many people grew up who do not know how to use their rights. These people might be educated, they may read Shakespeare and listen to Bach; but not know the law, be unable to defend their rights, and may not even understand what these rights consist of. Such are the bitter facts of life.

A strange situation comes to pass—we adopt good laws, but we take advantage of them timidly, unwillingly. How to explain this? The fact of the matter is that over-administration makes life easy not only for the ruled, but also for the rulers. Sitting and waiting for orders is far easier than thinking for yourself, for proving you are right, and taking a collective decision. This political lethargy and political indifference can be overcome only when the questions which directly touch on the interests of the people become the subject of truly collective discussion and decision. And that, by the way, is how to more quickly cure those suffering from skepticism; those who still do not believe that the process of democratization has seriously begun; or those who are afraid—or perhaps hope—that this is a temporary phenomenon, and transitory. Concrete experience will be our best teacher.

Not long ago a small report appeared briefly in the press. The deputies of the Gomel city Soviet had made a decision to halt production at the Gomelkabel Plant, if within a certain time-period the atmosphere around the plant were not cleaned up. This was sufficient to cause immediate action, whereas the many years of argument and correspondence with the USSR Ministry of the Electrical Engineering Industry did not bring genuine results. The branch management quickly allocated 2.6 million rubles for conducting ecological measures at the plant, and specialists were found capable of quickly redesigning the purification system. Is this not an example of the realization of the collective and its authorized representatives in the Soviet of their real capabilities and power! Another example comes to mind as well. Once again with the situation in Gomel. Deputy S. Avilkin of the Ulukovskiy Rural Soviet in Gomelskiy Rayon, together with his electors, had passed through all the bureaucratic obstacles, and built themselves a store for themselves, by means of community involvement.

Analyzing these facts, the thought involuntarily occurs—what if every collective and every activist approached the solution to his problems in such a responsible

manner... I am convinced that this would free the people from their serfdom, and would make it possible for them to realize their real rights and opportunities.

I believe that it is precisely in concrete matters and in the manifestation of true popular rule, that the representatives of the most varied spontaneous formations and associations could find application for the energies and their civic activeness. Not much at all is needed to do this—just the transition from talk, criticism of shortcomings and pathetic outbursts, to action, to active participation in the reform of the political system—in affirmation of glasnost and social justice.

[Gorelik] And the final question: about pluralism of opinion. In our view, many people today understand it too narrowly and directly—according to the principle that "everything is permitted that is not forbidden." However, blind allegiance to this logical rule in discussion will hardly be of use. After all, how often are we witnesses to such "disputes," wherein instead of arguments and facts, personal attacks, passion and ambitions, and the application of labels prevail...

[Tarazevich] I can't recall where I read it right now, but I like the idea: "Culture—is tolerance for another person's opinion." Well said, in my opinion. The moreso, that today we are all actively learning the ABC's of political culture, and the many-faceted culture of glasnost and democracy. I don't think anyone has any doubts that since April 1985 the party has stood firmly on the revolutionary principles of renewal, and is ready to hold an open dialog with absolutely anyone who speaks out in favor of perestroika and socialism.

It is another matter that quite often many communists, including communist leaders and ideological workers do not have enough skill, steadfastness or ordinary human tact—and sometimes they simply lack the desire—to go out to the people, to hear them out carefully, and to share with them, as they say, their sorrow and their joy.

A discussion arose—whether to discuss, or if necessary to make them change their minds, or at least put up a good argument in defense of the party position. You can be assured, that people will always be able to determine who is who, to distinguish the demagogue and the babbler, the upstart and the windbag, and the newfound leader who is "for perestroika for the sake of perestroika." But for this, I repeat, all of our commissars—and I have in mind both party, and Soviet, and economic activists—must be as never before at the epicenter of the meetings, both programmed and spontaneous, at the "round tables," disputes, meetings and discussions. We do not have enough true political battlers; and we do not have enough patience with one another. All of this taken together does not come all at once; it must be steadfastly studied, to comprehend the difficult science of perestroika. Studying, helping one another, to include—and I make no exceptions—one's own mistakes and blunders as well: at times disappointing and bitter ones.

You mentioned such concepts as "labels" and "ambitions." Oh how we all wish that they would hurry up and disappear from our everyday lexicon—whether in the newspaper or from the rostrum is not important. But you see they have become fixed, like a birth-mark, in our consciousness. And we toss them about them quite often, not giving any thought, to the left and right, at times insulting one another, and thereby mistrusting not only those around us, but above all our own selves.

And it is not only the instant "meeting leaders" or new unofficial organizations who are guilty of this, but also completely mature officials. Moreover, they are quite ready to defend their categorical, dogmatic "convictions." In this connection, the public statements of one of the leaders of the Kolkhoz imeni Lomonosov in Lyakhovichskiy Rayon, Comrade Belousov, are typical: he is quite simply convinced that communists, he says, should not acknowledge any such millennium of the baptism of Rus, and that believers and especially sectarians, represent "creeping counterrevolution," are anti-Soviet, and so on. It would not be worthwhile commenting upon, if this were the only case.

Militant ignorance is, I think, more biting than any kind of unprincipled appeasement, yea-saying and toadying. Perhaps, I am repeating myself again; but I stress that it is necessary, no matter what, to learn to defend our values under conditions of socialist pluralism of opinions. We must master this science, in order to continually purge our society of everything borrowed and alien to the very nature of socialism; to forestall new digressions, falsification of our history and the conscience of the soviet people, and its essential internationalistic nature.

Returning to the rather difficult and rather extended conversation at the session of the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium, where the events connect with the aforementioned Sunday, 30 October, were analyzed, I would like to reiterate: Let us all try to acquire patience and prudence; let us stop communicating in the language of precipitate ultimatums and groundless accusations against one another. It is time to find that which unites us and not that which divides; it is time to operate, not on the basis of endless appeals, but to discuss concrete matters. Only the consolidation of all strata of our society under the single flag of perestroika, proclaimed and steadfastly conducted by the Leninist party, will bring the real fruits of revolutionary renovation. Only together are we strong; only together are we able to shoulder any problem, be it economic, social, or cultural. That is the way I understand our party's policy at the present stage, and I am firmly convinced of it.

Chuvash Obkom Secretary Defends Restructuring Efforts

*18000235a Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA
in Russian 6 Dec 88 p 3*

[Article by A. Leontyev: "Answer from the CPSU Obkom"]

[Text] In the article "Heavy Burden of the Past," writer M. Yukhma (Sovetskaya Kultura, August 16, 1988)

claims that perestroika has not gained much ground in the Chuvash Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. He says that the heads of Party organizations and the Soviets go out of their way to slow down the restructuring, paying lip service to glasnost and democratization, and that the wind of change which started in April 1985 is bypassing the Republic. As a result, "people feel frustrated and hopeless."

In this connection, the Chuvash Obkom of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is authorized to report that a new political climate is taking hold of the Republic following the decisions of the April 1985 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th All-Union Party Conference. Workers, collective farmers and intelligentsia are displaying a higher level of activity in civic matters and at work. Their dedicated efforts have resulted in a 20.4 percent increase in industrial production and a 21.4 percent rise in labor productivity over the past two and a half years of the 12th five-year plan period, which is above the planned targets. The consumer goods targets have been exceeded as well. Between 1986 and 1987, the gross agricultural output went up by 14 percent and the work efficiency increased by 29 percent, also above the targets of the current five-year period.

The construction of housing, civic and cultural facilities is on schedule too. Operating under full cost-recovery, the industrial, construction and assembly organizations, collective and state farms also are meeting their profitability targets.

However, the 7th Plenum of the Regional Party Committee, held in November 1987, unveiled serious shortcomings in how the Obkom Bureau is enforcing perestroika and trying to improve the style and the methods of work of the Party, and economic organizations and of the Soviets. The regional party organization is eliminating these shortcomings at present. Specific steps have been taken to accelerate the social and economic development of the Republic, expand the scope of glasnost and democracy and improve personnel recruitment and placement. Better conditions are being created in order to stimulate people towards more productive work, everyday life, and leisure and to satisfy their needs and demands.

To buttress his conclusions, M. Yukhma cites either erroneous or outdated facts, and shortcomings which were relevant many years ago. However, prompt remedial measures were taken to correct these shortcomings, as was reported by the national and local papers.

For example, there is no proof to support his allegations that he was harassed, or that appointments are parochial, or that the "Vurnar clan" exists in the Republic. The heads of Party, trade union, Komsomol organizations, the Soviets and the ministries and other agencies come from all regions of the Republic. He also wrongly alleges that some writers were persecuted in the 1960s. For

example, writer A. Talvir had to leave for Kazan following a public outcry over his hitting and killing a girl in a car accident. V. Rzhakov's play "Outright Stupid" was lambasted by the literary critics. The latter criticism was reported by Sovetskaya Kultura and local papers in May 1963. The article, "Bathhouse," published in Literary Gazette on May 12, 1976, was discussed by the Obkom Bureau and by the Cheboksary City Party Committee. Strict party reprimands were issued against those guilty, and some managers of the No. 5 construction organization were put on trial.

In April 1986, Sovetskaya Rossiya criticized the Chumak Party Gorkom and the Komsomol Obkom in the article "Promotions From Bio-Data Pool" for serious shortcomings in the recruitment, placement and education of Komsomol workers. The heads of the CPSU Gorkom and the Komsomol Obkom were sternly punished by the CPSU Obkom Bureau. The wrong-doers were relieved of their positions.

Cheboksary's Leninskiy CPSU Raykom bureau administered a Party reprimand in 1986 to A. Yemelyanov, Chairman of the Board of the Chuvash ASSR Writers' Union, for the mistakes he made on his job. The 10th Plenum of the Party Obkom, held on July 11 1988, relieved L. Tyangov, referred to in the article, of his job as Secretary of the CPSU Obkom for having displayed an irresponsible attitude in preparing an article for the "Druzhba" almanac.

M. Yushman fails to mention that many cultural facilities have been built in the Republic lately, even though the development of culture used to be placed on a back burner. These new facilities include a musical theater, an art museum, a Pioneers' Palace, district cultural centers, the cultural centers built by enterprises, collective and state farms and a stadium in Cheboksary. Local branches of the academic drama theater and the children's theaters, have been opened, as has a state philharmonic society. A total of 23 amateur theatrical companies stage performances. Statues of the Chuvash educator I.Ya. Yakovlev, Civil War hero V.I. Chapayev and a bust of K.V. Ivanov have been unveiled. The cultural centers have been given the names of such distinguished Chuvash poets as M. Sespel, P. Khazungay, and Ya. Uksay. Some streets in the Republic's capital have been named after N. Ashmarin, I. Bichurin, N. Ilbekov, Uyla Mishin, S. Elger and other luminaries.

In June 1988, the Bureau of the CPSU District Committee appointed a commission, chaired by A. Petrov, President of the Presidium of the Chuvash ASSR Supreme Soviet, to elaborate and implement measures for fostering closer relations between ethnic groups and to improve the internationalist education of the working people in the Republic. The election Party meetings, including those currently being held in creative associations, are discussing new ways to improve organizational and ideological work in the atmosphere of greater democracy and openness.

Leningrad TV Quality Praised As Glasnost Vanguard

18120048a Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English
No 49, 11-18 Dec 88 p 4

[Report by Dmitry Yefremov (Leningrad), and Andrei Vasilyev (Moscow) from Leningrad TV, Channel 6]

[Text] "Even though we have 7 TV channels to choose from in Tallinn, including three Finnish, Leningrad programs are the best. We think your TV has outgrown its regional station status and that it is high time to give it all-Union status. *The Serov family*."

This is not just a compliment. The Leningrad channels' potential TV audience is over 15 million, and it is watched all over the North and North-West of the USSR. Starting next year the popular TV program, *Monitor*, will be broadcast every week on the 2nd all-Union programme.

Leningrader Dmitry Yefremov and Muscovite Andrei Vasilyev report from Leningrad TV, 6, Chapygina Street.

Dmitry Yefremov: the air is unpredictable

10 a.m. "C'mon, c'mon!" Alexander Nevzorov, author and host of many 600 Seconds, the most popular and the shortest TV program, waves his hand to me from the mini-bus.

We rush across the city. The bus has a receiver tuned constantly into the militia news band. The team gets the news about what is happening in the city.

"A fire," says the militia centre.

"I've got it!" Nevzorov says into the mike.

Again I understand the popularity enjoyed by 600 Seconds and its host. As soon as people see Nevzorov inside the bus, we are let through, passing all the guards.

"It's OK now!" Alexander smiles. "It was quite different when we started. We weren't known or trusted, everything was secret, a mystery."

Live shows right in the street with the mike and TV camera have become a familiar sight to Leningraders. Several years ago, after some of the broadcasts, the studio received calls from TV watchers and colleagues, asking how on earth they were allowed to show them.

Far from everything was permitted, but the idea was considered all right—even before the swift advent of glasnost, the idea to democratize TV and to draw people "from the street" into the program. The Public Opinion show, that appears now and again, which made people talk about themselves, did exactly this. Now it goes on for three hours at peak viewing time, with an interval for the evening news program, *Vremya*.

A topical subject is chosen and specialists brought in. It is announced beforehand where people can have direct communication with the TV Studios. Tamara Maximova is the host. She, of course, has her own opinion about the problem, but the air is unpredictable. A sudden thought and the subject is seen from a new angle, passions flame, the plans are broken and only the tact of the host, and her conviction that even strange opinions are useful, makes it possible to find a way out of often sticky situations.

There is real probing (watched by millions) of public opinion, nothing staged, prearranged or edited out by a host of people. No wonder the program is so popular. 10 per cent of the viewers take a direct part in it—before the cameras in the street, over the telephone or at the computer centre.

Leningrad TV has another program, *Fifth Wheel*, shown twice a week, which does not always go smoothly. It is a chamber show with sharp subjects and problems. I've heard the opinions that the *Wheel* overdoes it. But, maybe, that's just it—in order to make something bent straight it should be bent backwards? Today the journalists have more opportunities than they use.

Obsolete traditions and hangovers from the stagnation period like "self-censorship", are sometimes expressed by talented journalists, who feel the "moment of truth".

Each issue of the show *Time of Answer*—Today comes live on the air. It focuses attention on concrete problems in the city. People call in with unexpectedly pointed questions. A live show doesn't let you "escape responsibility". The people on whom the solution of problems depends are before the camera—you see at once how competent and well-meaning they are.

6 p.m. Alexander Nevzorov and I watch on monitor what we'd filmed in the day. We relive the fire, the talk with a customer at an empty shop counter and the meeting with the juvenile delinquent at the militia station.

"Sport is on already!" the director warns. This means that *Vremya* is ending and 600 Seconds is soon to start.

"Good evening!" the figures on the time counter on the screen start running—600, 599, 598....

The hosts' light talk, always ironical, gives no hint about all the work that goes in to preparing the 10-minute program. A whole day's work.

"Now there's mainly water on the teleprinter," Nevzorov smiles. "Tomorrow it'll be dry in Leningrad, sunny...."

The last two figures flash—002, 001....

"All the best!"

Andrei Vasilyev: the screen's life on earth

What, then, has changed at the Leningrad TV studios? Not staff numbers—there are still some 700 people. Its average viewing time—still 4.8 hours every day. Therefore its financing is as before.

Alexander Yurkov, first vice-chairman of the Leningrad TV and Radio Committee, doesn't want to give too much importance to the quantitative indice of live showing—30 per cent. Because these 30 per cent also include ice-hockey matches, symphony concerts and study programs. But did the three-and-a-half-hour-long meeting of Leningraders with the authors and editors of the SOVETSKAYA KULTURA newspaper, shown without a single cut, but two weeks later, lose anything? Of course, the fate of the program could have changed very much in these two weeks, for a real struggle had to be waged for it. But it ended in victory.

And could Monitor count on victory when it was born 12 years ago as a direct challenge to the official style of the Vremya news program? Now, in spite of its old age, Monitor is considered a "speciality" of Leningrad TV. Musical Ring was born in 1983 and also in torment. It is impossible to describe the inventions its authors had to resort to so as to retain the spirit of a live show, even when the musical discussions had been maimed by the organs of culture. Now Ring has won recognition as the only musical-sociological program. And wasn't this the point of departure for our information-musical programs and our sensational program—Public Opinion?

The discussion program Fifth Wheel can also brag of pioneering, but of a different kind. It was the first to offer the TV rostrum to Academician Andrei Sakharov, the first to show the rehearsals of Yuri Lyubimov at the Taganka Theatre, and the first to show TV items about Viktor Nekrasov, Alexander Galich, Venedikt Yereofeyev. The first "people's film" was also made with the help of the Fifth Wheel. The authors informed TV viewers about Gennady Beglov's short novel "A File on One's Self," and proposed to raise the money to film it. Lenfilm Studios is now shooting the film.

How do they manage to do all that?

Yuri Afanasyev, director of the Main Directorate of Film programs, reduced the question to technology.

"It is regularity. We've drastically cut the number of our showings, once a week. People wait for them. If we didn't show any of the films, it would cause a huge scandal."

The people expect not just a set of TV stories, but meetings with TV journalists whom they have got used to trusting. That's why the car of the 600 Seconds crew is supplied with themes and addresses right in the street. That is why the Telecourier's "social ambulance" is sometimes waited for with the same impatience as a real

ambulance. That's why people spend money sending telegrams to Public Opinion, and even more money on charity actions announced by the Fifth Wheel.

Two years ago in Leningrad admissions was announced to courses for TV people. 1,700 out of the 6,000 candidates got through. 30 were admitted to the courses. Two of them now work at the TV. One is a host, another—a director. Announcers, who used to be more scarce, now have catastrophically little work. A good-looking person, who can read an alien text, with the same intonation at all times soon loses the spectators' confidence. 600 Seconds is considered a classic model of information giving. The first showing on June 23, 1987, was announced as a dilettante experiment, and survived only thanks to the audience's support. Viewers sensed the arrival of personalities at once. Not that Leningrad TV didn't have them before, they simply started to set the pace. And the pace proved to be alien for the "firm pros" who started feeling themselves overshadowed.

Boris Firsov was head of Leningrad TV from 1962 to 1966. Legends about his "rule" are still being told, as about the golden age. Once, on a Tuesday (the program was called Literary Tuesday and was included in the First All-Union TV program) there was a live discussion about the ruined toponymy of our streets. This wasn't Firsov's only misdeed, and it was probably the last straw. He was dismissed "for weakening control".

I selected precisely this man as an opponent. He said: "I wouldn't like to offend the fellows. I realize that many of them are walking on a razor edge. But I do have some comments about their work. I think the Fifth Wheel is getting too much out of its own leftishness. It shows a phenomenon but doesn't analyze it. The same can be said about Telecourier. Public Opinion, it seems, wants to have people come to the square with one opinion and go away with another. This just doesn't happen. An opinion must be shaped. The program is also unpredictable. There is no guarantee that you are watching the main news. It has something of a no-choice aspect to it.

"However, I think I know the reason for this. It comes from the uncertainty of the creative executives at the State TV and Radio Committee. The expansion of the border of glasnost is the result of an onslaught from the bottom, not the stand of the 'top'. It is rather its concession. There is even the belief that some bad points are being scored (if we return to the old order). I hope I'm mistaken."

**Soviet Press Coverage of Baltic Political Events
Faulted**

18120048b Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English
No 48, 4-11 Dec 88 p 15

[Article by Vitaly Marsov: "The Press and Controversy"]

[Text] Can one get an objective picture of what is happening in Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia by reading our press? Hardly.

At first there were precise reports about Baltic movements to support perestroika—the Popular Fronts in Estonia and Latvia and the Sajudis in Lithuania. These reports were followed by feeble attempts to analyze these movements' manifestoes.

Then events took an unexpected turn: after the October 22 and 23 publications of projected amendments to the USSR Constitution and the election law, the Baltic movements came out against the proposed amendments. The press was silent and the information gap was filled with speculations and rumours.

Paradoxically, we now know more about what is going on in Afghanistan than in our three Baltic Republics. Thus the new amendment to Article 74 of Estonia's Constitution passed by the Republic's Supreme Soviet and some other documents came as a rude awakening. The reports in the central (Moscow-based) press were incomplete and extremely contradictory.

PRAVDA (Nov 19), article by Procurator of the Latvian SSR J. Dzenitis: "Matters have come to such a pass that many of them (Popular Front leaders and activists—V.M.) have categorically (in the form of an ultimatum) demanded that the bills be entirely rejected thus cutting short the political reform initiated by the CPSU.... Chairman of the Popular Front of Latvia, member of the CPSU D. Ivans appeared on Latvian TV calling for mass protests against the bills."

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA (Nov 21), interview with D. Ivans: "Let me quote the first lines from our Charter: 'The Popular Front of Latvia (PFL) is a mass public political organization of the Republic resulting from patriotic activity of the people. It actively supports and takes part in the radical reconstruction of our society in line with the provisions of the resolutions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 29th All-Union Party Conference.'"

Only one thing is clear today and that is that the session of the Supreme Soviet of Estonia accepted documents which were ruled (preliminarily) unconstitutional by the USSR Supreme Soviet. The November 18 session of the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania, according to a TASS report, "failed to support decisions at variance with the current USSR Constitution". (Latvia's Supreme Soviet convenes November 22 when we go to press.)

Our readers are largely unaware of how the Baltic Republics reached their decisions.

Before me are recent editions of the national dailies. The front pages are full of reports from India along with mostly insignificant communications from other countries. Gorbachev's visit to India is, of course, a front-page event. But so is the situation in the Soviet Baltic Republics! Dozens of special Soviet correspondents were dispatched to Delhi. They sent back exciting press and TV reports. How many correspondents were sent to

Tallinn, Vilnius or Riga? Judging from the absence of prompt and complete information, very few or none at all. Meanwhile Baltic-based correspondents were conspicuously reticent.

MOSCOW NEWS was among the first papers to report the founding of Popular Fronts in the Baltic Republics. But this was when these organizations were still relatively uncontroversial. As soon as conflicts arose, MN did little to distinguish itself from other papers.

Yes, the USSR has established a smooth-running system of glasnost which at times amazes even the Western press. The trouble is that the system has skidded in a number of extreme situations. First in Chernobyl, then in Sumgait, Stepanakert and Yerevan. Our Moscow-based national dailies reported from those places mainly after the fact. Ditto the Baltic Republics. This suggests that we are still not ready politically to be in the readers' service when the waters of socialist democracy are troubled.

There seems to have been no dearth of media reports on these events in the Baltic Republics themselves. There were complaints that the press in the national languages reported one thing while the press in Russian reported something else. The Popular Front in Estonia has access to all the rostrums while the Intermovement and the Amalgamated Council of Production Collectives has access to almost none.

Thus the tendency in Moscow is still to give short shrift to "unpleasant" information. The tendency in the Baltic Republics is different—pluralism of certain views and limits on others. There are several reasons for this situation. The first in the adherence to the ideas of the popular fronts of most people in the Baltic Republics; especially of intellectuals with access to the press, microphones or TV cameras. Hence, the intentionally or unintentionally biased attitude towards those who think otherwise.

The second reason is perhaps the reaction to the sluggish Moscow-based press, which tends to first give the information that it (or someone else) regards as correct rather than all the information, all the points of view.

The third reason is that our media are ossified. Isn't it sad that Estonia's Intermovement has no mouthpiece of its own? Why not get one or even more and quickly? Why not start a daily? Or give it its own TV channel? This, of course, means turning for help to the many government agencies with unpredictable results. Truly our past kicks back.

The press is supposed to be a mirror of events, not a reducing or magnifying glass. Lenin urged journalists to write the history of their times. History without events is sheet nonsense. Journalism without the history of events can of course drive people, but it can never promote perestroika and democratization.

I will not analyze the events in the Baltic Republics. Nor will I analyze the pros and cons of the proposed amendments to the constitution. My point is the media's role in covering these problems. I'm sorry to say, I have some strange feelings. Sometimes (most time perhaps) I want to shout like Stanislavsky: "I don't believe it!"

Take the interview with Deputy of Estonia's Supreme Soviet Vasily Koltakov in PRAVDA (Nov 20). It was headlined "Why I voted against." A good headline. And it is good that a national paper reported the opinion of one of the seven deputies who voted against the amendment to Article 74 of Estonia's Constitution passed by the Republic's Supreme Soviet. But the overwhelming majority voted for the amendment! Where can we read their arguments?

At one time our press reflected what the majority thought because the majority was ever in the right. Is the minority now in the right? So the press only presents the minority view? And we should be amazed that Estonian papers carry interviews with those who voted for the amendment? Is it simply that they have learned the rules taught them over decades?

Why not first give all the facts, then say what the people involved think and only then analyze the situation.

Finally, isn't it time to found an institute of parliamentary correspondents whose job would be to cover events like the ones today? Perhaps the whole problem is the absence of those who can professionally write about MPs, who argue with each other because they are trying to do something, deputies of our Supreme Soviets?

Stalin's Interpreter on 1949 Talks With Mao Zedong

18300151a Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Oct 88 p 4

[Article by Nikolay T. Fedorenko, Soviet China specialist and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences: "Pages of History: Nighttime Talks"]

[Text] The victory of the Chinese revolution was one of the most important events of this century. The establishment of the People's Republic of China on 1 October 1949 was a turning point in the history of a great nation, which thus set out on the path of socialist construction.

That same year a Chinese government delegation headed by Mao Zedong visited the Soviet Union. Talks were held in Moscow, with the Soviet side represented by I. V. Stalin and other party and state leaders of the time.

Relations between our two neighboring socialist states have gone through various stages, some of them difficult ones. Today, thanks to efforts by both sides, many aspects of those relations are changing in a positive way. People in our country are watching sympathetically as the working people of China strive to bring about modernization of their country. The similarity of tasks facing both the USSR and the PRC presents broad opportunities for mutually advantageous cooperation between them and for exchange of experience.

The memoirs published below are by N. T. Fedorenko, a Soviet China specialist and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences. They are taken from his forthcoming book and tell of the situation surrounding the 1949 Soviet-Chinese talks in Moscow; they include heretofore unpublished episodes connected with the talks. These memoirs are of particular interest due to the fact that their author, at that time an aide in the Soviet Embassy in the PRC, served as interpreter at the talks and is describing events that he actually saw and heard.

The meetings and talks between Stalin and Mao usually took place at a dacha in Kunitsevo, outside of Moscow. They always took place at night. As a rule the members of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolshevik) Central Committee Politburo sat around a long table with Stalin at the head. Mao Zedong sat next to the host, if one does not count the interpreter, who sat between them. The Chinese comrades were seated next to their leader. The table was always set for dinner: in front of each seat there was a table setting, goblets, small glasses, mineral water and several bottles of dry Georgian wine. Vodka was not served. There were also platters of greenhouse-grown vegetables and greens on the table. A sideboard at the end of the long table served as a buffet. Each person took whatever he wanted. Occasionally Stalin would get up from the table, go over to the sideboard and choose what he liked. He was in the habit of recommending certain dishes, things like kharcho, borschok and shashlyk. There were only a few dishes, but they were very delicious. There were no servants in the room. The only

person who came in was one waitress who would bring in some freshly-cooked dish, show it to the host and then leave it on the sideboard. Each person poured his own wine, but everyone drank very sparingly; the majority were only pretending to get drunk. Most seemed only to be taking an occasional sip of wine.

The decanter of cognac standing in the middle of the table was passed around when it came time to drink a toast to Stalin. The toast was proposed by Beria, who was sitting opposite the host. He struck the table with his palm and a crystal glass, the loud sound intended to let everyone know that a very solemn moment had arrived. He quickly cast his rapacious gaze around the table to make sure that everyone had filled their glasses with cognac. Then he stood up and made a cordial speech several sentences long and proposed that everyone empty their glasses.

Stalin usually drank a few swallows of dry wine from his footed crystal goblet, mixing red and white wine from two bottles placed near his right hand and from which he alone drank.

The topics of discussion were wide-ranging. There was no set agenda. The conversation was almost exclusively between Stalin and Mao Zedong. Everyone else kept quiet. However, in the course of their unconstrained conversation the two speakers exchanged opinions on military, political, economic and ideological matters. This was how the main points in the Treaty on Friendship, Union and Mutual Assistance between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China were negotiated. Specific talks on the contents of the various articles in the treaty were also held; the Soviet delegation was headed by A. I. Mikoyan and the Chinese delegation by Zhou En-lai. The treaty was signed on 14 February 1950 by the USSR and PRC ministers of foreign affairs, A. Ya. Vyshinskiy and Zhou En-lai. Stalin and Mao Zedong, as well as members of the Central Committee Politburo and the Chinese CP Central Committee, were also present at the signing ceremony.

Incidentally, I feel compelled to comment on an absurdity depicted in the movie "Risk," which was recently shown on the Moscow Television channel. This in connection with the fact that Stalin and Mao Zedong are standing side by side in a photograph published in our press on 15 February 1950. Just a few minutes before that picture was taken I had interpreted their merry conversation concerning the successful signing of the treaty.

With regard to this photograph the film's narrator states completely without foundation that the look and postures of Stalin and Mao Zedong speak for themselves: they reflect dissatisfaction over the fact that the Chinese leader was going home empty-handed. He had not succeeded in obtaining a nuclear weapon during his visit to Moscow.

I must state that this is pure fantasy on the part of the movie's creator. Mao Zedong never brought up the question of nuclear weapons during his talks with Stalin. That subject was discussed much later, in 1958 rather than in 1950.

The treaty was the culmination of the Moscow meetings and negotiations between the leaders of the two great powers. This historic event was greeted with a sense of great satisfaction not only in the Soviet Union and China. There was a tremendous response from the most distant lands of both East and West. Something that had long ago been predicted by the genius of Lenin and of which Chinese revolutionary Sun Yat-sen had dreamed had become a reality.

Only among our enemies did the signing of the treaty evoke hostility; it was seen as part of a sinister international communist conspiracy. Of course this was a predictable reaction. Therefore it came as no surprise. On the contrary, it was a natural outgrowth of the situation.

Once Mao Zedong, reminiscing about the difficult days of past battles against the Kuomintang army, told how a communist military unit found itself surrounded by the enemy. The situation was very grave, and the fighting bitter and very bloody. But the encirclement could not be broken. Then the commander addressed this appeal to his troops: "Do not think about the difficulties, do not be afraid of trials, look at death as returning."

I had difficulty catching the meaning of this aphorism as it was spoken aloud. Therefore I asked Mao Zedong to write the phrase down on a sheet of paper in Chinese characters. Taking paper and a pen he quickly wrote eight characters in his characteristically sharp strokes. On previous occasions we had often resorted to this sort of "hand talk." Firstly, it is not always easy to comprehend quotations from ancient writers when they are spoken, as they were written in archaic language, either "guwen" or "wenyan," which are intended for the eye, not the ear. Secondly, Mao Zedong spoke in his native provincial dialect, the "Fulan" (Hunan) dialect, which differed substantially from the language of Beijing, in the north. This required that the interpreter pay particular attention to the speaker's tone and pronunciation.

All the individual characters were quite familiar to me. But I simply could not grasp the need on account of the final character "gui" which means "to return." I had to ask Mao Zedong to explain the meaning of the character again and give his interpretation of the aphorism in that particular context.

"How much longer are you two going to be conspiring?" Stalin interjected in his imperious voice, taking me by surprise.

You can imagine how I felt at that moment. It was as if an electric shock had run through me... I was aware of

Stalin's lack of self-control from listening to stories told by people more experienced than myself.

"The problem," I began in a sheepish tone, "is that I am having difficulty understanding..."

"Hasn't your difficulty lasted too long already?" he said, in what sounded like an accusation. At least that was the way I interpreted it.

"There is one character here..." I once again tried to explain.

"So now you want to burden us with arcane lore about characters, do you?" he continued implacably.

"Essentially the only problem is with a single character," I hastily said, "but in literal translation it means..."

"Translate this symbol and the entire phrase literally!" he ordered.

I did so. Stalin, who in my estimation was a subtle word artist, pondered for a moment. After a short pause he asked:

"And what is Comrade Mao Zedong's interpretation?" he asked in a somewhat more conciliatory tone. "That is precisely what I was trying to find out, but Mao Zedong has not had a chance to say anything yet."

"Well, go on with your conspiring!" said Stalin without turning his head in my direction. But Beria was looking at me from behind his pince-nez with eyes that were as piercing as those of a hawk; I could feel his gaze.

I turned back to Mao Zedong for a clarification. He said that this expression was ascribed to Yo Fei, a famous military commander of ancient China; he lived in the 12th century and was renowned for his campaigns against the invasion of the Chzhur-Chzhen tribes. The tomb of this hero of the resistance against the Chzhur-Chzhen is preserved in the city of Hangzhou; it is famed for its depiction of kneeling figures representing the traitors who killed Yo Fei.

"The character 'gui'," continued Mao Zedong, "is not used in its ordinary sense of 'to return,' or 'to come again' in this context. In this historical context 'gui' means 'a return to one's original state.' And although Yo Fei's name is familiar to many people in China, very few Chinese know the true meaning of these winged words. Thus, the expression should be interpreted as: 'Ignore all difficulties and suffering, regard death as a return to your original state.'"

"After patiently listening to my translation of Mao Zedong's clarification and pondering it for a moment, Stalin said quietly:

"Obviously he was a talented commander... Noted for both fearlessness and wisdom."

I had the same physical sensation as if a guillotine blade hanging over me had been removed. It seemed that everything became bright again and the specter of conspiracy was forgotten. But there was a whole crowd of similar specters around him, anyway. He fancied that he saw traitors, spies and enemies of the people on every hand. When I reached home early the next morning the first thing I did was take down an interpreting dictionary of Chinese phrases and verify again that I had correctly understood Yo Fei's expression.

My thoughts often turned to the terrifying and edifying episode with the aphorism of Yo Fei. However, I should note that I bear no grudge against anyone but myself. Of course it is impossible to know everything about the Chinese language. But the way I was engrossed in what I was doing obviously seemed provocative. I should have explained from the very start that I had run into a problem and was requesting a clarification from the speaker. I myself had provided the grounds for a "clarification of relations."

"In general Stalin was always calm, restrained and attentive to his guest during his talks with Mao Zedong. He never became distracted by anything else. He was completely focused on the subject of the conversation. He took pains to make his expressions and the formulation of his sentences precise and to choose his words carefully. He was extremely exacting with regard to the presentation and phrasing of ideas and nuances of speech.

One could say that this was all a superficial display. Stalin purposely wore a mask behind which he hid something inexplicable. All the more so because he had soft gestures and precise intonation.

In this part of my memoirs I do not touch upon the monstrous crimes for which Stalin was responsible. Yet it is impossible to deny that Stalin possessed a kind of hypnotic power, a formidable air and a demonic majesty. His entire appearance and the way he carried himself and conversed seemed to say to those around him that power should be mysterious, because the strength of power lay in its inscrutability. Hence his personality cult was wrapped up in puzzles and secrecy, was surrounded by great mystery. Here I am speaking of my personal feelings, which were perhaps not always objective.

To my imagination the very place where the talks were held was reminiscent of the nighttime meeting place of demonic forces. Stalin had only to appear in a room, and everyone around him seemed to hold their breath and freeze in place. Danger arrived with him. An atmosphere of fear was created where he was.

I recall an episode that was once related to me by a well-known party official who was at that time editor-in-chief of PRAVDA.

"We were sitting around late one night," he recalled, "going over the proofs for the next issue. Suddenly the Kremlin telephone rang. Without looking up from the column I was reading I picked up the receiver and casually said hello.

"This is Stalin speaking," said the voice on the line.

"Which Stalin is that?" I blurted out without thinking. "The Stalin..." I heard in reply; realizing the absurdity of my situation I tried to make excuses... Since then I have had this nervous tic...and I'll have it until the day I die.

"When Stalin was not in the room a spontaneous conversation would sometimes begin among the people sitting around the table, people who were endowed with virtually unlimited power and unimaginable rights. Even in the host's absence the highest echelon of the elite demonstrated unswerving loyalty and devotion to him. It seemed that they knew everything, but that everything they knew was wrong. They seldom behaved in a natural manner, as if they were afraid that the human being in them would not prove equal to the posts they held. Unfortunately when conversing with people they seemed considerably less impressive than they did in their Kremlin offices behind their huge desks bought at public expense, in their immobile oak armchairs. I observed these personages of the highest nomenklatura without obstruction and unbiassedly, looking at them both up close and from a distance. Like in a movie that lasted for years. In a word, in my eyes these people were models of the contradictoriness and inconsistency of human beings. Suffice it to note that as a rule they read from a paper when they spoke, reading words written by someone else with some difficulty, often ignoring all rules of grammar and punctuation. They were accustomed to breaking all the rules, including traffic regulations when they traveled in their long limousines.

At first I was surprised to find that many of them almost never read. They were not familiar with their own country's literature. They sometimes judged writers on the basis of gossip and all sorts of obscene rumors. They had not the slightest knowledge of foreign authors. But ignorance cannot stand being unable to comprehend something. A limited person instinctively despises the thing that he does not understand, portraying it as an enemy. I was always ashamed when in conversation with foreign journalists some members of the nomenklatura elite demonstrated such ignorance that it was simply embarrassing to translate what they had said. No, they did not seem to know what great benefit can be derived from the reading of books and memoirs.

The question naturally comes to mind: did Stalin realize all this, did he know his inner circle? Absolutely, without a doubt. Stalin was an uncommon individual, willful and very well informed. That is, of course, in his best years. But he was also a gifted actor and conductor of people. He was a great manipulator. It would be wrong to deny that many people believed in him. They believed when

they did not know the true Stalin, yet even today, when much has become known, there are still quite a few people who continue to live on illusions.

This poses another question: how did power, either small or great, wind up in the hands of people who had no moral right to wield it? Which traits fostered their rise? Who promoted them, and why? Stalin, of course, had a keen understanding of the people around him. Across the ensuing years this has become even clearer. The individuals who formed a tight ring around the leader hardly represented any threat to him. They were not in competition with him, because they were beneath him in every regard.

At one of the meetings, held as always at the dacha outside of Moscow, Mao Zedong, who was sitting beside me, asked me in a whisper why Stalin mixed red and white wine while none of the other comrades did so. I replied that I really could not explain it and that he should ask Stalin himself. But Mao Zedong adamantly refused to do that, saying that it would not be tactful.

"What sort of illicit whisperings are going on over there? Who are you hiding things from?" said Stalin over my shoulder. His words evoked a kind of superstitious dread in me. Startled by the unexpected question I turned toward him, but what I saw were the rapacious eyes of the man wearing the pince-nez.

"Well, the problem is..." I began.

"Yes, yes, out with it..." interjected Stalin. "Comrade Mao Zedong would like to know why you mix different wines while the others do not," I blurted out.

"And why did you not ask me?" he said, attempting to trip me up. I had long before that noticed that he suspected me of something and did not trust me.

"Pardon me, but Mao Zedong insisted that I not, feeling that such an inquiry of you would be improper..."

"And whom do you prefer to listen to here?" asked Stalin with a certain cunning. Then, smiling beneath his mustache he began explaining to his guest why he mixed the wines:

"You see, this is a longstanding tradition of mine. All wines, especially Georgian wines, have their own flavor and aroma. By combining the red and the white I enrich the flavor and, most importantly, create an aroma that is like the sweet-smelling flowers of the steppe."

"Comrade Stalin, which wine do you prefer, red or white?" asked Mao Zedong, to whom grape wine was unfamiliar. In China wine made from grapes had only come into production quite recently, and only on a northern peninsula in the city of Tsingtao, where a German colony had once been established. It was the Germans who had established the vineyards.

"I most often drink white grape wine, but I have faith in the red because once, long ago when I was ill with typhus during my time in exile a certain kind doctor in the prison hospital secretly gave me small doses of red wine, Spanish, I think. It saved me from certain death. Or at least so I believe. Since that time I have always been conscious of its healing properties," Stalin said pensively.

...Once again I was keenly aware that for certain dignitaries an interpreter is merely an automaton, a machine, a computer. He should never forget his role. He is not permitted even for a moment to be distracted or entertained by the search for truth, for thus he could create a permanent negative image of himself in the eyes of the self-assured braggarts and give them cause to think badly of him.

Yet development of our relations with China is unthinkable without experts, China specialists who are familiar with the history and present-day life of our great neighbor and with the intellectual world of the Chinese people. I think it appropriate to mention that Chinese studies in our country have since time immemorial been renowned not only in our own country but also far beyond its borders. It is indeed unfortunate that on account of the interplay of circumstances the training of China specialists in this country is not adequate to meet present-day requirements. Alas, there is no overabundance of well-educated sinologists in this country. And not just because of the tremendous effort and diligence required to master the Chinese writing system. It is much easier and simpler to master any European language and make a career in it. The other reason is that we must get the state interested in the training of China specialists, people who are well acquainted with China's past and present, the traditions and customs of its people; who have mastered the character writing system and modern conversational speech. This will require radical changes, the sort of structural transformations that would be in line with revolutionary restructuring of our entire system.

I would like to relate an episode in which I myself was a participant. During Mao Zedong's visit to Moscow in February 1950 our cultural department decided to familiarize our Chinese friends with intellectual life in our capital. It was decided that we should begin with the pride of Soviet ballet "Krasnyy Mak" [The Red Poppy] at the Bolshoi Theater. As you know, the theme of the ballet pertained to life in China, or at least so the authors and producers of the ballet thought. In order to make the greatest impression Glier, who wrote the music for "Krasnyy Mak," was invited to the performance.

For some reason not at all coincidental, I believe Mao Zedong was unable to attend a performance at the Bolshoi Theater, although everyone wanted him to do so.

The group of our Chinese friends was headed by Chen Boda, a famous ideologue. Sitting in a box reserved for honored guests, our Chinese comrades were keenly interested in the production and bombarded me with questions, some of them quite ticklish.

"Tell me, what kind of a monster is that?" Chen Boda abruptly inquired as the person playing the role of a pimp in a Shanghai brothel appeared on stage.

I explained as best I could, but he was not mollified. "Is that terrifying creature supposed to be Chinese? And are all the rest Chinese as well? Is that how you imagine us, since you depict us that way? And I suppose this delights you, doesn't it?"

I tried to tell him that each person has his own vision and his own perception. And that it is very difficult for foreigners to play the role of Chinese. They have to wear makeup...

"Is the makeup the only problem? Look at his whole personage, the way he behaves. This is monstrous..." said Chen Boda, still highly agitated.

The further the plot of the ballet progressed the more questions Professor Chen Boda asked and the more incensed he became. It was approximately midway through the show that he expressed a "heartfelt" desire to leave the Bolshoi Theater.

I will not describe in detail how much effort it cost us to restrain our Chinese guests from what diplomats would call a scandalous demarche.

Following the performance we were invited to the office of the theater director where, as was to be expected, refreshments were served for our Chinese guests. The further development of this scene merely served to exacerbate an already embarrassing situation. Chen Boda and his entourage had not the slightest interest in the magnificent furnishings, the gilded tables and velvet-covered chairs, the impeccable service, the attention and hospitality. Instead of a lively exchange of impressions concerning the ballet an odd silence prevailed.

Naturally the hosts were expecting compliments and praise from the grateful Chinese, for whom a special presentation of "Krasnyy Mak" had been arranged. Yet they remained puzzlingly silent. Then I, as was proper in my role as his escort, asked Chen Boda to share his impressions.

"Please excuse me," Chen Boda began, "but we found the very title 'Krasnyy Mak' somewhat disappointing, the reason being that in China we regard poppies as the personification of opium. Perhaps you are not aware that opium is our mortal enemy because it has brought ruin upon our people for centuries... Pardon me, I did not wish to offend you..."

We left the Bolshoi Theater, never to return. Our Chinese friends had no more desire to become acquainted with the masterpieces of Moscow theatrical art.

Our Chinese friends' visit to the Bolshoi Theater resulted in the ballet "Krasnyy Mak" being temporarily removed from the repertoire. But after the title was changed to "Krasnyy Tsvetok" [The Red Flower] the ballet was performed again. It was otherwise unchanged.

I do not want to be a moralizer, but "Krasnyy Mak" turned out to be a complete farce. This episode is, I believe, a testimony to ignorance. A careless attitude toward the life and experiences of others, in this case of our closest neighbors, and a taste for the exotic had consequences that could spoil not only people's mood but also harm ties of friendship and good-neighborliness.

I cannot measure the harm done by episodes like this with regard to our intellectual ties with foreign countries. But I am convinced that we should make problems of culture and cooperations in the intellectual realm our top priority, not relegate it to relatively minor significance. For it is precisely with culture that relations, spiritual enrichment of individuals and entire peoples, mutual discovery, convergence, understanding and cooperation between people all begin. Only after this do trade, economic and other relations develop. This is especially significant in the case of a country like the Soviet Union, which is striving to create a world of the highest intellectual values.

...Today it seems to me, as it seemed to me at the time, that Stalin had a keenly suspicious nature. He was pathologically mistrustful. He trusted no one. He was prepared to regard anyone as unreliable and he saw malicious intentions in everyone. I preferred to be extremely circumspect and cautious so as not to give him even the slightest reason for doubt.

Every meeting between Stalin and Mao Zedong yielded something unexpected and unpredictable. The content of the talks was wholly determined by the host, who, however, never revealed the topics of discussion in advance. Usually the conversation would begin with, say, some theoretical topic. Either the guest would show an interest in something or the host would bring up some subject at his own initiative.

Thus, in the course of the discussions a program of language and thought was discussed. Essentially Stalin took the same stance as was found in his well-known work on linguistics. His basic idea was that language as a means of conscious expression of thought is not linked to a person's class origin. Any person can speak any language, including the language of Pushkin, Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, etc. This is all determined by an individual's level of education and personal interests.

It is noteworthy that in turn Mao Zedong pursued the idea that the Chinese character writing system and spoken language are, despite all the difficulty of mastering them, in actuality accessible to everyone, to every human being, if a person has the desire to master them completely, regardless of that person's social status or

class origin. It is a different matter altogether that in the past not every Chinese had been able to afford the education required to master Chinese characters.

"Comrade Fedorenko," Stalin said to me, "hand your plate over here to me.

"As I leaned toward him he said, as usual not looking in my direction:

"Take some of this. It is a rare dish. Perhaps you will be tasting it for the first time in your life... The first and the last, as the saying goes.

"Naturally I thanked him for the food, but an alarming thought ran through my mind. Was it not suspicious that when the waitress brought in this dish she showed it to the host, exchanged whispers with him and then left the platter next to Stalin instead of placing it on the side-board?

"Well, tell me, Comrade Fedorenko, did you like the dish?" he soon asked me.

"Excuse me, Comrade Stalin, I was lingering over it," I managed to say. "It has a very delicate taste..."

"So why didn't you say so?" he added, almost approvingly.

Indeed, the dish did turn out to be delicious; it was turkey baked with pepper and salt. A Caucasian delicacy.

Everything turned out fine. My fears had proved unjustified. The apotheosis of ill will and evil did not occur. We value people for the good that they do. And we despise them for the harm that they cause us. People should not disillusion one another, confuse each other or sow the seeds of suspicion.

This episode brought to mind another incident connected with Mao Zedong's visit to Moscow.

An urgent call on the government telephone made me rush to the Kremlin, where Mao Zedong was staying at that time. I was met by a high-ranking chief of the special guard who said to me with obvious agitation:

"Mao Zedong's personal Chinese cook has caused something of an uproar; he is refusing to cook or even accept the fish that we brought him."

"What kind of fish is it?" I asked the special services colonel.

"Carp, which is what we usually have brought in for our guest," he told me.

"So what is the problem?"

"The cook only waves his arms at us and refuses to take the fish, thus all this uproar..."

"Naturally I had to speak to the Chinese cook to find out what was bothering him.

"This fish is already dead, I do not know how long already. But I have strict instructions from Mao Zedong to cook only live fish for him," the chef burst out in good Beijing dialect.

This simple misunderstanding caused a real commotion in the vitals of our special service.

"Are you serious? Is that all?" the colonel exclaimed. "We'll immediately fetch him a fish alive right down to the gills..."

It is never too late to plant a tree, a folk saying goes, though others may reap the fruits of it. But you are the one who will have the joy of life.

Time passed. December 1949 was past. So was January 1950. A date in February was approaching: the date for the signing of the Treaty of Friendship, Union and Mutual Assistance between the Soviet Union and China.

"Comrade Stalin, we would like to give a small reception following the signing ceremony," said Mao Zedong during one of his regular meetings with Stalin.

"Of course," said his host.

"But not at the Kremlin, where I am staying, but instead in some other place, at the Metropol, for instance."

"But why not at the Kremlin?"

"You see, Comrade Stalin, the Kremlin is the place where the Soviet Government holds state receptions. That would not be quite appropriate for our country, a sovereign state..."

"Yes, but I never go to receptions at restaurants or foreign embassies. Never..."

"Our reception without you, Comrade Stalin... No, no, simply unthinkable. We request, we implore you, please, to agree to come," insisted Mao Zedong.

There was a pause; Stalin did not hurry with his reply. He seemed to be collecting his thoughts. Mao Zedong waited for him to agree like a confessor, never taking his eyes off him.

"All right, Comrade Mao Zedong, I will come, if you are so eager for me to," said Stalin finally, then changed the subject.

Thus a personal vow that Stalin had kept without exception his whole life long was broken.

On 14 February the Chinese hosts and their guests gathered at the appointed hour in the banquet hall of the Metropol. And despite the fact that a festive atmosphere should have prevailed, many people's faces expressed concern and even anxiety: would he keep his promise, would he grace the reception with his presence? Quite a few oracles with the look of self-assured braggarts pronounced dire predictions. On the contrary, others were optimistic. On what were these predictions based? As usual, on the same thing that kitchen gossip is also based. Everyone kept glancing impatiently at the entrance. And I recalled another episode related by one of the Moscow wags. Here it is:

Once Stalin decided to attend a certain drama theater in the capital, but he wanted to do so without announcing it, in secret, so that there would be no unnecessary fuss and bother. He slipped into his box unnoticed and soon became engrossed in the performance. But he had not escaped the watchful eye of the theater director, who immediately spotted his guest and took urgent measures: a bust of Stalin was immediately erected in the foyer which he had traversed incognito.

After the show was over Stalin tried to slip out of the theater as unseen as before. While walking through the foyer he saw the bust and asked in surprise:

"How did that get there?"

...When it seemed to me that the atmosphere in the Metropol banquet hall could not get any more agitated I was approached by an important comrade in civilian clothing, who whispered to me in a confidential tone:

"You are supposed to meet the master in the vestibule and escort him in."

"Excuse me, but is that my prerogative? Wouldn't it be better if you did it, as usual?" I replied to the colonel, with whom I was previously acquainted.

"Better to forget about prerogatives for the moment. We'll talk about it another time; right now you, as a specialist on the Chinese language, are being requested, don't you understand?" imperiously declared the colonel.

I refrained from further discussion of the matter, but I could not quite comprehend what was going on; was I supposed to speak Chinese with Stalin?

Taking me by the arm, the colonel led me out to the vestibule and showed me where I was supposed to stand and "not take my eyes off the entrance." There was no one else in the vestibule. Only the man checking coats was at his post in the checkroom.

Soon the formal entrance opened and Stalin stood drawn up to his full height on the threshold, like a portrait in a frame. He cast a swift glance around the vestibule; then, noticing me, he headed in my direction as if toward a familiar landmark.

As he approached the coat check he began unbuttoning his overcoat; suddenly the man working there sprang to his side as if he were attached by a spring and servilely said:

"Allow me to help you, Iosif Vissarionovich..."

Stalin glanced at him, greeted him courteously and said with a touch of sarcasm in his voice:

"Thanks, but I believe even I can do this by myself..." Then he threw a friendly glance in my direction.

After removing his overcoat he went over to a coat hook, hung it up, placed his military cap on the shelf above it, looked in a mirror, straightened his hair and turned to me:

"Well, how's it going? Is everyone assembled?"

"Yes. Comrade Mao Zedong and our other Chinese friends have already been here for a long time waiting for us."

"In that case, escort me in," he said, laying his hand on my shoulder.

So I escorted Stalin into the banquet hall, where he was met with loud applause and noisy, enraptured exclamations. The enthusiasm was universal, it came from both the gloomy pessimists and the very cautious optimists.

For a moment Stalin stood still and looked around at the people gathered there. He asked me to lead him to Mao Zedong, who was standing behind the long "presidium" table. They greeted one another, shook hands and exchanged some general phrases relative to health and business matters. Then the Chinese comrades, starting with Zhou En-lai, began to approach Stalin, greeting him and shaking his hand. Everyone was in a cheerful mood. Stalin's cohorts stood a short distance away: Beria, Malenkov, Khrushchev, Voroshilov, Mikoyan, Shvernik, Suslov and Bulganin.

Then the toasts began. Good wishes were loudly proclaimed. Speeches were made one after another. All the speakers, and not just they, could not tear their eyes away from the two figures standing side by side and interjecting something into the conversation from time to time. These interjections consisted of various rejoinders, coming mainly from Stalin.

Finally Stalin who was obviously worn out by the endless ovations and the captivated audience began to sort of appeal with his eyes, saying that it was perhaps time to stop. But in vain. Nothing of the kind occurred. All he got in response were more waves of ovations.

Everyone waited impatiently for the most important part: what Stalin had to say. It was he who should and could say something to be treasured, something that would express the truth of the moment and the profound meaning of this historic event. And in a single moment he did so. Picking up a goblet of wine, Stalin gestured to get everyone's attention and announce that it was his turn to speak.

He proposed a toast to Mao Zedong and to the success of the People's Republic of China.

And everyone amicably emptied their glasses. Then the roar of applause, the enraptured cries and the general jubilation continued anew.

Readers Favorably Assess Stalin, Criticize Gorbachev

18110018a Kiev *SILSKI VISTI* in Ukrainian
19 Nov 88 p 2

[Article by M. Lysenko: "The Cult of Stalin and Sausage: Reflections on Reader Responses to Our Articles"]

[Text] Army Commander 1st Rank Yakir had long since been executed, burned to ashes, and wiped from the face of the earth, while his murderer, who some time later would adorn himself with a generallissimo's uniform, mocked his dead victim, heaping brutal curses upon him. A death of famine was marching through thousands of Ukrainian, Belorussian, Russian and other villages and farmsteads, while speeches about how well we were living resounded from forums large and small. A terrible law, unheard of by mankind, was in effect for several years, under which 12-year-olds were put to death, while nice little stories of the type: "He took little Gelya in his arms and recalled all the children...." were being told about the author of this savage, barbaric law, about Stalin.

And at the same time we, either blind and deaf, or insane from our own frenzy, from our irrepressible desire to sink even lower, to bow down even deeper in loyal obeisance, at that same time we were holding political rallies day and night, supporting, ratifying, demanding more and more reprisals. If somebody wants to deny this, let him look at any of the newspapers of those years, at any of the official collected volumes of those years, paper for which was always in ample supply. Or let him open the pages of the notorious "Short Course," which people had to study practically from kindergarten.

I seem to hear a categorical retort in no uncertain terms: What is this "we"? It is almost 40 years now since Stalin died. New generations have grown up. Why on earth hang on them the sins of others?

There is nothing "of others" in the history of our people—everything is ours. Our Kiev Russia. Our victory over the Golden Horde. Our Pushkin and our Shevchenko. Our Decembrists. Our tsars. Our Karakozov. Our People's Freedom movement followers. Our Tsushima. Our Great October Socialist Revolution. Our Lenin. And that terrible calamity—the reign of Stalin—is also ours. Echoes from that time remain with us to this day: this is attested in particular by the editors' mail, or more precisely by reader responses to articles against the Stalin reign of terror.

It is these echoes I would like to discuss. Not for the purpose of stigmatizing, nailing to the wall, etc—neither have I such an intention, nor is there any need. What is needed is something else—to examine and analyze that on which present-day Stalinists base their views and to examine their arguments.

There is essentially one argument. "Under Stalin vodka cost 2 rubles 60, and wine—90 kopecks. Buy as much as you want!" writes M. Znayda from Litvinovka in Narodichskiy Rayon, Zhitomir Oblast.

"The stores were filled with goods—to eat, to drink, to smoke," adds V. Tymchuk from the village of Komso-molskoye, Kozyatinskiy Rayon, Vinnitsa Oblast. "The village was alive with song!"

Similar sentiments are expressed by V. Taranenko from the village of Krasnoye in Kobelyakskiy Rayon, Poltava Oblast, I. Hryshchuk from the village of Pavlovka in Ilinetskiy Rayon (Vinnitsa Oblast), and others.

We have published numerous letters in the past about what was holding sway in the village during the time of Stalin and what there was more of—songs or tears. And we shall continue printing such letters in the future—the editor's mailbag is straining under the weight of these letters, the stream of which is not abating.

One can only be pleased at this: finally the people have been given the opportunity to say what they think. It is unfortunate that some people's thoughts do not go further than the shop counter.

All of us need the store, and the more goods it contains, the better it is. But good people, are we truly capable of looking at the world only through a sausage? Even when the topic of discussion is great public suffering, our common tragedy, which cost us countless deaths and unparalleled physical and spiritual oppression? Or are we perhaps indifferent to everything as long as vodka and sausage are cheap? Just what kind of people are we if we consider a full trough to be the summit of happiness?

Things are tough today as regards food, manufactured goods, and many other things—we see all this, and we talk about it openly. And in the fact that we are not afraid of our own shadow, as was the case during Stalin's time, that we do not listen intently at night for the creaking of wheels or the sound of footsteps outside our door, in all this is assurance that we are people after all, not mere cogs in a machine, and that we will be able to surmount all difficulties, although we know that it will not be today and will not be tomorrow—perestroyka is precisely for this purpose.

The Stalinists of course react to all this differently: they are shocked at the very mention of this term—perestroyka.

"You should be tried as enemies of the people," writes Nykyfor Fedorovych Bondarenko from Dnepropetrovsk Oblast, a party member since 1942, referring to us newspaper people. "Why is everything getting more expensive? You can't find soap or sausage. Gorbachev has made everybody into a critic...."

We agree entirely: it is wrong that soap and other essential goods have disappeared and that prices are climbing steadily upward. We hope that the appropriate agencies will finally draw the proper conclusions, and an end will be put to the shortage of goods, which often is a consequence of incompetence, carelessness, and sometimes criminal negligence.

But let us give thought to another matter as well: why is it that today we have so many shortcomings in trade and in many other areas? Where are the roots of this tenacious weed?

If we are objective, we cannot help but see that the roots are to be found in that same place, in the Stalin era. The Stalin era, among other things, also engendered another evil—the system of government by administrative fiat. No, this is not an abstract concept. This is thousands upon thousands of concrete individuals invested with authority but lacking organizational talent, knowledge, and concern for the well-being of the people. And why did they need talent, knowledge, and concern, when the godfather of the System set before his clan a quite different objective—to stand around him as a wall, to look not downward but upward. And to ensure they stood as required, that they looked in the direction they were supposed to look, and that they prized their position, for this Stalin was generous of favors, or in other words—with the public moneys: envelopes with double salaries, special apartments, special vacation accommodations, special stores—from him, the "modest and frugal" Yosif Vissarionovich.

The system operated for decades. Those who were at the bottom were taught to be submissive and to keep their mouths shut, while those who were on top were taught arrogance, that they could do anything they liked, and that they were immune to punishment. All this grew and

spread, penetrating increasingly deeper into all branches, sectors and domains, and ultimately transformed the country into a gigantic military barracks, where there is not so much thinking as there is commanding and submitting.

This continued right up to the present day. For this—for allowing the Stalinist system of leadership and management to exist, and for taking so long to see the light—we are now paying the price with a neglected economy, disorder and confusion which is bizarre for a planned economy, and the need to learn rudiments which we should have known at least half a century ago. Why is it so surprising that we have a shortage of foodstuffs, building materials, reliable machinery, and many other components of prosperity? Where were we supposed to get them, if we are only now beginning to understand where they are to be found?

But that is not all. The Stalinist system, like a fatal disease, attacked the most important thing—people's souls. During the course of decades it crippled people psychologically and emotionally, crippled people's consciousness, and produced spiritual impoverishment, at the same time implanting selfishness, callousness, and cruelty. Even today this evil is making its presence known, evidence of which is the letters from Stalin's defenders.

Viktor Ivanovych Vovchenko (Zhitomir, 17a Lenin Street) writes in a letter to the editors: "We agree with former public prosecutor Ivan Timofeyovych Shekhovtsov from Kharkov, who calls for charges to be brought against writer Oles Adamovych, for insulting the honor and dignity of Stalin, as well as the honor and dignity of Shekhovtsov himself. He claims that Stalin, by his policy of repression, practically handed Adamovych over to the tender mercies of fascism. As far as I am concerned it is too bad that he did not finish his job. There would have been one less slanderer."

D. N. Buryak from Novoukrainka (Kirovograd Oblast): "I read in *SILSKI VISTI* that they want to build a memorial to the victims of repression, and I had to write. So they want to erect a monument. Go ahead and erect it. We have all kinds of monuments in this country, only not that kind. A real necessity. My goodness, so many people have come forth, claiming their daddies were hauled away. Nobody was ever taken away without cause. There was good reason to arrest those bastards...."

Mykhaylo P. Koshuba from Kotelva (Poltava Oblast): "You write that Stalin sentenced innocent prisoners. In 1941 I was 12 years old. I was a witness to everything that took place. A 40-man Soviet platoon was occupying a defensive position on the Vorskla River. We local boys often went over to visit their position. They did not fire a single shot. Three Germans rode up on horseback: 'Russ Soldat, surrender!' And they all amicably climbed out of the trenches and put up their hands. They were led to the center of the village. One of the Germans on

horseback played a harmonica, while one of our soldiers tapped his foot in time to the music. The German laughed uproariously: 'Gut, Russ Soldat!'

"I hate cowards, panic mongers, and traitors, and yet you are treating them like innocent victims...."

We share your opinion, Comrade Koshuba, of cowards, panic mongers, and traitors: they deserve eternal dishonor and disgrace! We know that such incidents as you describe did in fact occur, to our great regret and pain. But we know something else as well: entire armies were taken prisoner just in the first months of the war alone.

Hundreds of thousands of our officers and men! And not because they were cowards, but because Stalin's policy, even before the Hitlerites attacked us, doomed our Armed Forces to inevitable terrible casualties and to unprecedented retreat, death, and captivity. So after this how can everybody who suffered the consequences of Stalin's high-handed rule be considered traitors?

It is this we are against. Just, incidentally, as we are against myopic thinking, superficiality, and deliberate prejudice in judging the past: distortion of the past inevitably leads to repetition of old dramas and tragedies and to new misfortune.

Markov Defends State Prizes in Literature, Arts
18000233 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 88 p 3

[Article by G. Markov, Chairman of the Committee for the Lenin and USSR State Prizes in Literature, Art, and Architecture, USSR Council of Ministers: "Returning to the Topic: Who Should Be a Laureate"]

[Text] The awarding of the USSR State Prizes each year is a kind of annual review of the state of literature and art, and identifies works that have demonstrated that they have entered the national consciousness, passed the test of time (although sometimes a rather short segment of time), and influenced not only the development of art, but the spiritual world of their contemporaries.

If one analyzes the work of the Committee for the USSR Lenin and State Prizes, as manifested in the names and works cited in the recently published decisions on awarding the USSR State Prizes, one cannot help but notice a sharp increase in the stringency of the criteria and standards for evaluating works. Now the evaluation process takes no account of either authors' past accomplishments or their present professional and social positions; but only of the quality and significance of a particular work. Preference is given to works that have discovered something new about the artistic assimilation of reality. The new approach to awarding the prizes eliminates contentious or controversial works from consideration.

The process is no longer impeded, as it was during the period of stagnation, either by administrative pressure applied on the members of the committee, or by "addition" from above of laureates whose works the committee has already rejected.

All these changes for the better are directly associated with the revolutionary processes occurring in this country and in the life of our society.

These days, discussion of works nominated for the USSR State Prizes has been very incisive, critical, substantive, detailed, and comprehensive. To be frank, even those works which were finally awarded prizes did not escape criticism. Among them was the famous novel by Vladimir Dudintsev, "White Clothes," devoted to the tragic pages in the history of Soviet biology. While reproaching the author for a certain narrative prolixity and the artificiality of some of the plot lines, nevertheless the members of the committee preferred this work because it offered something new in the artistic investigation of life. Nor did the Moscow Folk Music Ensemble, directed by D. Pokrovskiy, have nothing but supporters; however, the committee considered it essential to support its efforts to revive rare examples of folk music, particularly, those associated with the art of Russian polyphony and its endeavors to make musical folklore the property not only of a narrow circle of specialists—but of all

lovers of music and our native art. The range of viewpoints represented in the committee and its independence from any preconceptions can also be seen in its decision to name as laureates in the most venerable of our critical fields—literary critic Lidiya Ginzburg (for the world famous books "On the Literary Hero," and "Literature In Search of Reality") and professor A. Chegodayev, for his discovery of a new approach to the art of Eduard Manet. A prize was also awarded the film "Do You Think It's Easy To Be Young?" by Latvian documentary film-makers, in recognition of its controversial treatment of vital problems even though it was far from being universal acclaimed by audiences.

There is no need to enumerate all the works awarded USSR State Prizes this year. I would however like to direct your attention to what I consider one additional important aspect: the committee's decision did not diverge from the opinion of the majority of authors of articles in the press and letters to the editors of newspapers and journals addressed to the "judges" themselves. Of course, the selection of the prize winners is not a merely mechanical process of counting votes. It is real labor to be called upon to render a professional evaluation. And it is precisely the performance of the role of an authoritative, stringent, and objective professional judge that is required of the committee by readers and viewers concerned about the value of our most prestigious prizes.

Sometimes one hears people voice the desire to have absolute openness in the activities of the committee, to have the details of the discussion shown on television, etc. At first glance, it would seem that such a demand is more than appropriate in this era of glasnost. But, one thinks, there must be a reason for the fact that not one jury for an artistic competition, either here or abroad, does its work in front an audience, or a television or movie camera. After all, it is precisely this circumstance that ensures freedom and sincerity in what is said and protects the authors of the works under discussion from unnecessary trauma. We believe that, in the future too, committee members must be provided with the conditions needed for free discussion and the expression of a variety of evaluations in order to enable them to ultimately come to a joint decision.

Proposals to eliminate state prizes have been heard recently. But for what reasons? The reasons given relate only to such things as isolated errors, inflated evaluations, or concessions to administrative pressure in the awarding of the prizes. And yet didn't many prizes play a positive role in supporting true masters of the arts and in publicizing the achievements of their creativity? Many artists in literature, theater, and cinematography can testify that, during years that were difficult, not only for art, but for all of our lives, the committee's support of works that were timely and posed serious social problems was extremely important in their lives and work. In practice, the committee can cite no few examples where it stood resolutely on the side of one or another new phenomena, concerning which opinion had not yet

formed, and which both the critics and the civil servants responsible for administering the arts considered a threat. And why, in general, should the people's government so arrogantly refrain from participating in the process of encouraging worthy works of art created for the people, and understood and accepted by the people? If we accept this then we should also eliminate State prizes in the areas of science and technology and productive labor. No, this is clearly excessive. In my view, it is essential to focus on something else—developing a better mechanism for awarding the prizes.

By the way, they are currently preparing the drafts of the new statutes on the USSR Lenin and State prizes. These will reflect many points expressed in PRAVDA and on the pages of other newspapers and journals. Let us say that those who want to decrease the established number of USSR Lenin and State prizes are probably right. There are currently seven Lenin and 22 USSR State prizes. The fewer the prizes, the the more stringent the selection of candidates.

I also agree with the idea that a longer period is required for discussing the works nominated for Lenin prizes: it would be better if the allotted time was, not 3 months as is the current situation, but at least half a year as is provided for discussion of works of candidates for the USSR State Prizes.

I think that the proposal that we publish not only the list of works selected by the committee, but also of all those which are initially nominated is worthy of consideration. This would increase the time the public had to discuss the works and get more people involved with their selection and consideration.

Television should play an important role in familiarizing the public with the works nominated; this medium can find impressive ways to impart information and has the capacity to organize substantive discussions in which specialists, listeners, viewers, readers, and scientific and labor collectives participate.

Many people are confused about why a prize should go to someone who has already received a state award (order or honorific title) in the same year. They have a single argument, too many awards cheapens the value of each of them. For the same reason people argue that the USSR State Prizes should not be awarded (to a given individual) more than once, as is the case for the Lenin prize.

However there is another point of view: true achievement by a master should be acknowledged—after all prizes exist to encourage creative success. Awarding of prizes must not be likened to granting of honorific titles. A prize acknowledges milestones in the artistic process, specific works of literature and art.

I also agree that we should establish a better system for nominating works for consideration for the prize, so as to preclude arbitrariness and haste. It is very important that competent creative and social organizations suggesting works for nomination have discussed them in the context of the totality the artistic year, taking account of the opinions of the broadest range of readers, viewers, and listeners. This guarantees that the most worthy works will not be neglected.

On the basis of my many years of work on the committee, the opinions of my comrades, and the letters and in keeping with the spirit of the times, I consider it desirable to establish a rule that the members of the committee and its directors serve, as a rule, no longer than two terms. And to make the process more efficient the number of members should be decreased, first and foremost, by eliminating those who are burdened by a large number of duties and responsibilities. The committee must consist mainly of people with artistic authority, rather than official positions. And it would be preferable if it were headed by an artist who was not also an official of one or another creative union. Recall that the first chairman of the committee was V.I. Nemirovich-Danchenko—one of the founders and artistic directors of the Moscow Art Theater, who held no other official posts. It is especially important to increase the proportion of highly qualified critics and art and literary historians on the committee. This would help to raise the level of discussion and would encourage deeper scientific analysis of the works. Without a doubt, the membership of the committee must be made public, not only in the collection of government regulations, but also in the press, as used to be done, so as to avoid any question of its being anonymous.

The current committee members (who are appointed by the government for four years) are ending their term of office. The membership includes figures in all the arts in all the republics of the Soviet Union, and also the editors-in-chief of a number of newspapers and journals. All of them are people possessing well-deserved authority, and strong individuality, who represent a variety of generations, have had a variety of artistic and social experiences, and hold a variety of opinions.

It is very important for the future membership of the committee to retain and increase all that is best from the committee's many years of experience performing this work; for example, the fact that prizes are not "attached" to a specific artistic discipline. I think it would be worthwhile to continue the "crossover" discussion of a work by the various sections (there are six of these in the committee); in other words, when, for example, literary people have discussed their candidates, they should go on to analyze, with equal intensity, the work of the architects, musicians, and representatives of other arts, while the sections for the other arts turn to literature. This makes available the fullest range of ideas about the candidates, and emphasizes the level of their social and artistic significance.

Of course, this is only a portion of the thoughts about how to improve the work of the committee that I wanted to express with a view toward its impending reorganization. The democratization of our life and the new social atmosphere have created conditions conducive to daring and inspired creative work by writers and artists, as well as to objective evaluation of their work by society and the state.

Uzbek Editor On Literary Scene Under Stalin, Rashidov

18000232 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA
in Russian No 45, 9 Nov 88 p 4

[Interview with Utkur Khashimov, Tashkent, Date not specified; Interviewer N. Khodzhayev, under the rubric "Writers' Organizations: Problems of Renewal": "Is the cup of endurance bottomless?"]

[Text] [Khodzhayev] Utkur Khashimovich, you have been editing the republic's "fat" journal for 4 years. During this time, have you succeeded in changing it?

[Khashimov] It seems to me that the journal has changed for the better. This is demonstrated by its increased circulation—today SHARK YULDUZI ["Star of the East"] has a circulation of more than 170 thousand. We have assembled, although with great effort and not without accusations of "cliquishness", our own group of authors. And we have ended up with a working group which gets along together well and is full of initiative.

Among the most interesting works published in our journal during the last 3 years, I would select the novel by A. Yakubov "The White Swans' Sorrow," the novellas "Parting After Holidays" by E. Agzamov and "White Cottage" by N. Atakhanov, and poetry by E. Vakhidov, Sh. Rakhman, U. Azimov, Kh. Khudayberdiyeva, and M. Solikh. Alas, time does not allow me to describe each of these works here, even briefly. Recently, we were able to publish an Uzbek translation of Ch. Aytmatov's novel "Executioner's Block," A. Tvardovskiy's poem "By Right of Memory," and "Requiem" by A. Akhmatova. In the very near future we plan to publish a translation of the novel "Children of the Arbat" by A. Rybakov.

Much has been said in our republic and on the pages of the national press about the need to publish the undeservedly forgotten works of the 1920s, particularly the works of Chulpan and Fitrat. For the information of those who have advocated this, we can say that last year the journal SHARK YULDUZI published a large selection from the poetry of Chulpan, and this year we published his novel "Night" (Nos. 2-3). Next it will be the turn of the play "Abul Fayzakhan" by Abdurauf Fitrat. The journal's interest in the little-known works of our past does not stop here. Let me remind you, for example, of the story by A. Kakhkhar, "The Birth of a Killer," published last year. As you can see, some changes have occurred. But I certainly do not want to extol these as due to my own efforts, or even those of the

journal's staff. The times in which we live have made it easier to work, we are not chewed out by the authorities, the higher-ups do not demand to see our galley-proofs. More trust has led to better returns.

[Khodzhayev] Let us go back a few years, to a time when people were not feeling so cheerful. A writer could not help but know about the padded figures, the enormous areas not under cultivation, about the fabricated heroes, who sprang up like mushrooms after a rain.

[Khashimov] You are right, many writers knew the true state of affairs. But the ones who knew the most were those, who, like skilled potters, themselves fabricated false heroes. The mechanism underlying the "canonization" of these heroes was simple to the point of banality: two or three laudatory articles or essays, several radio broadcasts, and, of course, a like number of "appearances to the people" on television, and the next ready-made "hero," "deputy," or whatever, was created. This system was all-purpose and self-maintaining - the writer fabricated the "hero," and he, in his turn, took care of "the people's writer," without, however, neglecting to record in his notebook or photograph (so as to preserve "unfond" memories) where and how much the writer got from him in signs of "attention." I would name those, if you will permit me to use the term, writers, but I do not want to disturb the souls of the dead. I would do better to name those who behaved honorably during those awful years of unbridled corruption. These include: A. Kakhkhar, the conscience of our literature, who, as early as the 1960s, with his satiric comedy "Voice from the Grave," warned us of the epidemic of bribes; M. Ismaili, who was not afraid to have an enemy in the person of the "father of the nation," Sh. Rashidov; T. Pulat, the author of the highly socially relevant story "Primak," who left us so early. I can not omit the names of the poets Yu. Shamansur and Kh. Salakh, who died under similar strange, confused circumstances. We still do not know the cause of their deaths; the investigations were not completed. Or consider the fate of the writer Shukhrat. What persecution he suffered, merely because he told the readers of the journal GULISTAN about the last hours in the life of his mentor, Abdulla Kakhkhar. How many broken, crippled lives! We had a writer, S. Karamatov, a wonderful editor and essayist, from whom I learned journalism. He wrote a novel, taking as the prototype for his hero one of the secretaries of the obkom, who has now been sentenced to 20 years of imprisonment. He wrote the book and later understood that he had made an error. Alas, the consciousness of that error cost him his life—his heart could not stand it.

Today, the cotton-grower receives a reasonable wage; at any rate, he no longer has to pay for various types of "counter" plans out of his own pocket. The main thing is that he already has faith and respect for his labor. But there are still many problems. One of them is the issue of the purchase prices for cotton. It seems that we, the writers of Central Asia, have set teeth on edge with our discussions of this topic. No meeting can be held here

without this issue being raised. We must increase the vested interest of the cotton growers themselves so that we can rid ourselves of the need to enlist the participation of hundreds of thousands of city dwellers and the associated enormous outlays. This is the only way to eliminate the frantic work stoppages in industrial production and education. Adding even 10-20 kopeks to the price of every kilogram would save millions, not to mention the costs of the "patriotic" plan calling on us all to be cotton growers. Such calls strongly discredit the principles of democracy. It is simply immoral to show on television 90 year old men or pregnant women stooping "with love" over bare cotton plants—"doing their bit." It is mortifying when pupils from a city school come to the editorial offices with complaints that they, who were completely innocent, were cruelly beaten by students from a neighboring school for voicing their "patriotic initiative," their ardent desire to go off en masse to the cotton fields. As they beat them, their tormentors waved the latest edition of the newspaper: "This is what you get for writing this, you skunks!....!" However, the letter the victims were supposed to have written was fabricated by the newspaper.

[Khodzhayev] Utkur Khashimovich, recently you have been working only in social and political journalism and have moved away from prose..

[Khashimov] That is not completely correct. It has simply gotten harder to write prose. There is the danger of following in someone else's footsteps. In addition, social and political writing has eliminated the freshness from many topics, and was right to do so. One cannot win over readers with the old formulae and even if one could, pride prevents it. Remember there was a cliché, or rather a disease profoundly infecting literature, in which the author would "agonize" over "specific evils" and allow free reign to his wrath, but only in order that, in the last chapter, a "fairy godfather" from the raykom, obkom or even the Central Committee (depending on the scale the author was aiming at) would come and at a stroke painlessly cut through all the knots of the problem. This is precisely the principle according to which the novels "Roots and Leaves" by Mirmukhsina, and "Whirlpool" by U. Usmanov were constructed. I regret that I too tested the "effectiveness" of this method in the novel "There Can Be No Light Without Shadow," and introduced into the plot the figure of the official from the republic's Committee of People's Supervision, Suleyman Rustamov, as a means of improving the difficult position of the hero—the journalist Sherzada..

[Khodzhayev] The disease you are saying existed in the past is still causing trouble today—the plot conflict occurs and takes its course and then, at the end of the plot, or rather, external to any plotline, they rope in the sleek figure of an important Communist, a ruler of destinies. The literary critic A. Rakhimov likened such heroes to the stork of fairy tales who is supposed to fly in on the twelfth night of Ramadan. If you manage to catch a glimpse of him, then all your wishes will be granted

immediately. The scholar asserts that that cliché we are dealing with here is only the modern version of the "heroic" plots of the old popular romances. One cannot help but agree with him, especially when we remember that the "evil demons" against which our hero-warriors fight are almost always presented in the caricatured form of popular romances, without any sort of credibility. This is precisely why the warrior heroes with their modern phrases appear less ridiculous before these dummy villains.

[Khashimov] If this is the tradition, then we must renounce it as soon as possible. But, alas, mental inertia is still strong. Another problem is that our novels have heroes who are loners, alienated from the common people, who, I assure you, have not been silent at all, although many have tried to present the matter otherwise. It could not have been any different, because here in our republic with regard to the people for decades there has reigned the principle of Nasreddin's unforgettable anecdote: "The coin is for me; and you get its clink."

[Khodzhayev] Let us assume that this was the case: the people were not silent, but the writers, the voice of the people, were astonishingly quiet..

[Khashimov] I do not agree. I have already discussed the satiric comedies of A. Kakhkhar. During the years of which we speak, he wrote a chapter of his unfinished novella "Earthquake"—on Stalin's repressions, which saw the light only last year on the pages of the journal "Shark Yulduzi." For long years nothing was said about the novel by Shukhrat "Gold Does Not Fade." He was the first of us to write about the years of the personality cult. Uygun's play "Flight" and A. Yakubov's novel "Conscience" were also written during these years. Remember too the satiric novellas and stories written by S. Akhmad and N. Aminov and P. Kadyrov's story "I Want To Live" where he fearlessly speaks of the death of people from the effects of butifos, from whose terrible clutches we escaped only after an article in "LITERATURNAYA GAZETA."

[Khodzhayev] But after all it was a time when the thief was not ashamed of being a thief; on the contrary, he was granted important positions and honors. And we, knowing very well that he was a thief, still bowed down to him. How can you explain such delicacy, if you will permit me to call it that?

[Khashimov] It is possible that in the depths of the people's memory there remained echoes of the old order—the Padishakhs did not pay civil servants a salary, being confident, that this gap would be filled by every sort of extortion.

[Khodzhayev] Under socialism they were paid. Where did this slave mentality come from? Also from the time of feudalism?

[Khashimov] We seem to have put an end to the slave mentality of feudalism by means of the revolution. Our own servility was born in the new epoch, for this reason it is especially ugly. It was born of terror, of 1937, and of Stalinism. The short respite after the 20th Party Congress only succeeded in changing our expression: we smiled with our hearts full of scorn. We made up anecdotes and aphorisms—we had to let off steam. Here is one of those sayings: "God made a mistake when he divided people up into bosses and subordinates, but bosses we have now never make mistakes." The anecdote is full of our melancholy and of our indifference, dull and hopeless. I do not know how much harm stagnation caused the economy, but I have seen with my own eyes how it corrupted people spiritually. We wrote something, trying to be optimists, but we could see no way out. This is the source of the myths about the "fairy godfathers," the updated utopias about the "just tsar" and the "sunlit city." No, there is nothing worse than lack of faith, it devastates the soul and makes writers into cynics and literature into banality.

[Khodzhaev] Professor M. Koshchanov has said that Umar-the-lawman, a figure you introduced in your last novel "Between Two Doors" was a predecessor of our newly discovered "dictators."

[Khashimov] That's completely possible.

[Khodzhaev] Does he have prototypes?

[Khashimov] He does. In our kishlak there was a similar character, they called him Khadzhibay-the-taxman. He worked as a tax collector. The people were poor and everyone feared him like the plague. He was a man of few words—if the slightest doubt arose, he would beat them with a whip. After my novel came out I received many letters. People wrote from Samarkand, Bukhara, everywhere and asked if I hadn't modeled Umar-the-lawman on their own terrible chairmen. There is no shortage of people who are dull and bad-tempered, like Umar-the-lawman with his terrible whip, the ruling principle of the Uzbek kolkhoz. But here is a paradox—such men lived modestly, without excess. Undoubtedly, such types are now attracting admirers of "stern but honorable hands." Come off it comrades, what kind of honor is this! They would have been happy to be dishonorable but matters more critical to their self-interest did not permit it, they simply did not have the time—they had to spend all their time ceaselessly doing evil, in order not to end up in

Stalin's camps themselves. The examples of Karimov, Gaipov, Adylov, and others show us what sort of metamorphosis Umar-the-lawman underwent in the 70s and 80s. These fellows were not averse to receiving benefits, they wanted their own legends. For this reason they made friends with writers and artists. Some even had their own "muses," for example, the former Minister of Internal Affairs of the republic, Kh. Yakhyayev who, in the time he had to spare from dirty deeds and amusements, wrote verse.

These men and others like them corrupted the fate of thousands and thousands of people, depriving them of fundamental human dignity.

We tolerated them, alas, for too long. The cup of our endurance turned out to be of unlimited size.

Today we sometimes speak about resistance to perestroika. It seems to me, however, that it has few ardent opponents. Those whom we call "disinterested observers," are really not all that disinterested; in the depths of their souls they still want a change for the better. They want this, but fear recurrences of stagnation. Their fear has still not been dissipated. There are millions like this. They can become good members of the union, if they can only be convinced of the irreversibility of the process. These people must be given a faith they can rely on, not empty slogans; they must be taught to respect themselves. To put it crudely we have to give them the opportunity to touch perestroika with their own hands—I see this as our primary task.

In concluding our interview I would like to retell a parable. Once upon a time in a certain kishlak the people decided to organize a feast. Each one was ordered to bring a cup of punch and pour it into an enormous vat. One of the villagers who was supposed to do this (either because he had no punch, or because he relying on his neighbors) poured plain spring water into the vat. All day long people came with their cups until the big vessel was filled to the brim. The time for the feast came.

You will have guessed already what the people got to drink from the common vat. They got plain spring water. This parable is applicable to our perestroika. We must not only rely on our neighbors, but ourselves contribute a little punch so that later we can drink from the communal vessel. We have waited so long and so patiently for perestroika, it would be all the more bitter to have to face disillusionment at its outcome.

Legal Expert Defends Proposed Curbs on Capital Punishment

18000311 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 24 Dec 88 p 6

[Report by G. Orlovskiy under the "A Scholar Comments on Readers' Letters" rubric: "Is it Always Necessary to Pardon?"]

[Text] The selection of letters offered below can be looked upon as reader participation in the discussion of the just-published draft of the Fundamentals of the Criminal Law of the USSR and Union Republics. The letters also reveal the depth of the peoples' interest in the high quality of the law.

The editors have already received more than 300 responses to the article, "Is it Always Necessary to Pardon?" (27 November 1988), and the letters are still coming in: "Although the newspaper article was presented on a polemical note, the position of the author is clear—a murderer must receive capital punishment. I am completely on his side!" writes M. Berdichevskiy of Rostov. "Of late I have had the opportunity to read the opinions of various literary figures and jurists, lamenting the severity of our law with respect to murderers. One need not be ashamed of severity. One would do better to give some thought to humaneness with respect to normal people and to protect their lives!" Teacher N.N. Zuyev writes: "Don't think that my statement is too bold—you have reflected the opinion of the people in your newspaper. Why, when they talk about mercy toward rapists and murderers, do certain humanists forget about mercy toward the millions of honest people, whom the law is supposed to protect..." And yet another opinion: "I am decisively opposed to capital punishment. And that is because I believe that man is not free in his fate. You see, it also depends on the circumstances in which a person finds himself, or has fallen into accidentally... I believe that the most inveterate criminals should be deprived not of their lives, but of their freedom—to the end of their days."—A. Tikhonov

I read the mail together with V.M. Galkin, a scientific research worker at the Scientific Research Institute on Soviet Legislation. I asked him these questions:

[Orlovskiy] Can one consider these responses a definite measure of public opinion?

[Galkin] Probably, sociological research would have been of more help here. But we have recognized and heard the living voice of the people. And it indisputably reflects to a significant degree the general mood. True, the positions of the readers and their arguments vary widely. There are simple "eye for an eye" attitudes, and there are deeply held, personal attitudes. As I understand it, the majority of the responses received insist on retaining the highest measure in the punishment system.

Others demand its wider use—for severe physical harm, for rape, and for especially large misappropriations and bribes. But with rare exceptions, the existing legislation already envisages this.

There are writers who insist on applying capital punishment for recidivist crimes (3-4 crimes, and regardless of their severity, the death penalty); for, they believe, the person has demonstrated his incorrigibility. A more moderate position was taken by those who consider capital punishment mandatory only for premeditated murder. In summing up, I will note that one clearly hears in the letters: Preserve in the law and apply more decisively in judicial practice the exceptional measure of punishment. I do not think that we have encountered any kind of "phenomenon" in readers' opinions.

[Orlovskiy] As is seen in the letters, the positions of the writers are not at all dictated by cruelty. But the question arises, why was it precisely now that articles have appeared on abolishing capital punishment? And why does a majority of our readers actively oppose such a point of view?

[Galkin] It's not difficult to understand the activeness. Everything that is taking place in the country today penetrates the hearts of the people. In this there is also a manifestation of democracy, of which in the past we could only dream. And legal reforms are now being made. Its direction is determined by the mood of society: democratization and humanization (in particular in criminal punishment). Those who have encroached on the foundation of society and the state, we want to return to full-fledged life in the most effective manner possible. This is a natural desire, and is one conception of society's responsibility for the fate of every person. The predominance of the administrative-command system was accompanied by cruelty and repressions. We have rejected this system, and its rejection also dictates the need for humanization of all life. Nor should we sweep aside altogether the experience of many civilized countries, where capital punishment has been abolished.

What do those who favor abolishing the highest measure of punishment take as their starting point? Human life is an absolute value, and deprivation by means of state organization and legal procedure is wrong. A person who deprives another of his life is a criminal! And the state should not take such a function upon itself.

It is far more important to learn the truth, which has long been defended by philosophers, and which V.I. Lenin defended: the chief thing is not the cruelty of punishment, but its irreversibility. And this is what should distinguish a legal state!

I would like for the readers to properly understand me: the question of capital punishment is a part of the problem of the severity of punishment. For more severe crime there is also more severe punishment. This is a requirement of elementary justice. But let us remember,

that severity of punishment has not ever provided a genuine reduction of crime. Humanization of all of life; of all social, political and economic conditions of human existence—and it is namely this that we are now striving to achieve—that is the path to the elimination of crime, and the re-education of those who have lost their way.

[Orlovskiy] **But what do you say to the parents, whose daughter was murdered (and that letter is before us)? Our general-humanist reasoning will certainly not console them.**

[Galkin] You can hardly console someone here. I merely wanted to explain the general tendencies, which, I believe should prevail in the consciousness of the people—and, that means, in the system of criminal justice as well. But the state of crime today, and I think the readers are correct here, does not permit us to reject the highest measure of punishment. It must, I believe, be retained in the law for the most severe crimes, and in any case for premeditated murder with aggravating circumstances.

[Orlovskiy] **And what do you say to the readers who speak about the "incorrigibles," about those who have already committed crimes more than once?**

[Galkin] I do not believe in a "special breed" of criminals. I would not like to repeat anew the arguments of the fact that every person is—a product of society. Nor are there any biological predilections for criminality. One need not cite any proofs here; our people are already sufficiently enlightened. But, one must give serious thought to execution of vicious recidivists. There is a proposal for lifelong deprivation of freedom, which would reliably protect society from possible encroachments. Such a measure of punishment should be examined in general.

[Orlovskiy] **In the letters we often found reproach against judges for the mildness of their sentences—they are afraid, they say, to mete out severe punishment to murderers.**

[Galkin] My many years of work experience have not given me any basis for reproaching our judicial practice for the mildness of its punishment policy. The incident with Zakharov in the article, "Is it Always Necessary to Pardon?" is still another confirmation of this. But you see, I do not refrain from reproaching the press. You love to describe "horrors" so much, that a reader who does not know all the circumstances of the case might indeed ask—And why have they punished so lightly? You must also strive to show all the circumstances which influence the sentence. Perhaps then there would be less emotion in the letters which we just read, and more weighty positions. In its policy for punishing criminals, the state cannot take emotion as its starting point. And if humanization of life is the demand of society, then it must be embodied in the law as well.

[Orlovskiy] **I would like to hear your opinion on the letters from R. SHAMINA, K. BATEVAYA, and others: "We do not insist that capital punishment be applied to all murderers. But experienced jurists are needed, who would be able to determine precisely the degree of guilt and the severity of punishment."**

[Galkin] In other words, we are talking about procedure. True, if the criminal is threatened with capital punishment, there must be special guarantees of fairness and legality. Probably it would be proper to think about increasing the number of People's Assessors in such cases, and pronounce sentence with their unanimous consent. I believe we must also respond to those readers who insist on "publicly" carrying out the sentence. This is unnecessary; bitterness is unnecessary. But a law on the procedure for carrying out such sentences is needed, and the carrying out should be publicized. Here there is no place at all for bureaucratic instructions, as things are done today. Only the law!

But I would like to conclude our conversation with the readers on another note: It is, you see, too bad that the conditions have not yet matured for abolishing the exceptional measure of punishment. And the movement must go in one direction; we must look to the future. It is formulated in Lenin's thought—to make the life of society such, that criminal punishment will be replaced by measures of social pressure. Every step in this direction—and here the humanization of punishment, which is reflected in the draft Fundamentals, will play a role too—must be supported by all the power and authority of the legal state which we are building.

Chief of UkSSR CP CC Civil Law Department Interviewed

*18110019a Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA
in Ukrainian 10 Nov 88 p 2*

[Interview, published under the heading "Restructuring of the Party Administrative Apparatus: Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee," with Arkadiy Stepanovych Chumak, chief of Civil Law Department, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, by A. Kraslyanskyy: "Comparing Actions Against the Times"; first four paragraphs are RADYANSKA UKRAYINA introduction]

[Text] Today we are interviewing Arkadiy Stepanovych Chumak, chief of the Civil Law Department of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

Perestroyka and glasnost have heightened people's interest in all aspects of the affairs of our society and party.

What did we know, for example, about the specific features of the operations of our party's Central Committee, its various subdivisions, and about the people who exercise political leadership of our country from its walls? Now, however, newspapers regularly inform their

readers about meetings of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and about decisions adopted by the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party.

As we know, reorganization of the republic party administrative machinery is presently taking place, in conformity with the guidelines of the 19th All-Union Party Conference and decisions of the October Plenum of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee. At the request of our readers, the editors have decided to report on the administrative structural changes in the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, and particularly on the newly-formed departments.

[Kraslyanskyy] Arkadiy Stepanovych, your department was formerly called the Administrative Organs Department. Now it is called the Civil Law Department. What is the reason for the name change?

[Chumak] The name was changed in connection with a radical revision of the activities of our department and the functions assigned to it in conditions of perestroika. While formerly we dealt primarily with oversight of administrative agencies, such as the Office of the Prosecutor General of the Ukrainian SSR, the republic Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Central Committee of DOSAAF, etc, we now exercise influence on the state of affairs and on restructuring of law enforcement agencies and defense organizations primarily through the party organizations and through party members.

Working closely with legal scholars, specialists and working people, we are implementing the party's decisions pertaining to establishing a legal system in our country which will ensure reliable protection of the legal rights of every citizen and the state as a whole and will increase the responsibility of governmental agencies for the smooth functioning of the machinery of law in all domains of economic and societal affairs.

I see the following as the specific work areas of the new department: organization and verification of execution of party decisions on matters pertaining to law, strengthening of rule of law and legal order, intensifying the campaign against crime, and improving mass defense work. The department's functions include party guidance of the activities of the agencies of the public prosecutor's office, justice, the courts, internal affairs, state security, courts of arbitration, the legal profession, the customs service, college of foreign law, DOSAAF, and civil defense agencies. Another important area of our work is legislative activity and the development of legal science in this republic, legal education, universal education in the law, as well as contacts with the military districts, the Black Sea Fleet, the Western Border District, individual large strategic formations and military commissariats, and assistance to organizations of war

veterans and soldier-internationalists. Our area of interest also includes matters pertaining to military-patriotic indoctrination of youth and preparing young men for service in the USSR Armed Forces.

Of course we do not consider the search for new work forms and methods completed; we are continuing to work on their interpretation and analysis.

[Kraslyanskyy] The range of activities of the department is truly quite broad. In order fully to encompass these areas and at the same time to ensure maximum efficiency, I would imagine you have designated some main, as they say, priority area in your activities.

[Chumak] We consider our main task to be organization and verification of execution of party decisions on matters pertaining to strengthening socialist rule of law and legal order and improving mass defense work. The path to our goal lies first and foremost through restructuring of the activities of cadres. Particular attention in this area must be focused on providing legal staff to local soviets and sovnarkhozes.

I would like to make particular mention of law enforcement agencies. They are obligated to work perseveringly in learning to work in conditions of broadening of democracy and glasnost and to rely on the support and trust of the people. In this area we see as our task the building of an orderly system of selection, indoctrination, training and advanced training of persons whose profession is to defend and protect the law. In restructuring and revamping the activities of this department as a subdivision of the Central Committee's administrative apparatus, we have intensified analytical and research activities. Here are some of the figures we have obtained. Only 200 persons among the tens of thousands of persons working in village, community, and rayon soviets possess legal training. Plants, factories, construction organizations, and other enterprises are not very well provided with legal staff. Is it therefore surprising that in the last three years the courts have reinstated 4,500 illegally-dismissed blue-collar workers, kolkhoz farmers, and white-collar workers, and public prosecutors have filed appeals against approximately 19,000 illegal orders by executives and officials which infringe the labor rights of citizens?

Recently a number of laws have been promulgated which regulate the rights and obligations of enterprise workforces and regulate individual and cooperative labor activities. Other legislative instruments will also be adopted. It is necessary that people be familiar with and correctly understand these laws in order to have a clear picture of them and to obtain benefit from newly-promulgated laws—and as you know, fundamentals of criminal law, a law on the judicial system, and a number of others are scheduled for passage. This is one aspect of the matter. Another aspect, as stated in the 19th Party Conference resolution entitled "On Legal Reform," consists in the fact that the forming of a socialist state of law,

reform of the political system, and adoption of new methods of economic management require the adoption of effective means of restructuring legal education of the public and organization of universal legal schooling as a unified general governmental and party program which will encompass all worker strata and all cadres at the central level and in the localities.

[Kraslyanskyy] The department is, first and foremost, people. Could you tell us something about yourself and about those who work in your department?

[Chumak] As for me, my entire biography is contained on a single page of my work record. After completing school I worked at the Kiev Aircraft Plant as a shop mechanic and worked in Komsomol. Later I enrolled in law school at Kiev University. Upon graduation I worked as an investigator, as an assistant prosecutor, and as deputy public prosecutor of Ivano-Frankovsk Oblast. Later I worked in the republic Prosecutor General's Office, and since 1971 I have worked in the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and, in particular, for 13 years as a department chief.

Intelligent, educated people work in our department, people with a mastery of party tactfulness and who are highly qualified. The overwhelming majority have had experience working in law-related agencies. They include, for example, deputy chief B. I. Vykhrystenko, sector chiefs I. Kh. Demydovskyy and V. I. Yashchuk, and inspectors I. I. Buravlyov and O. F. Shtanko. The average age of the people in our department has dropped considerably.

[Kraslyanskyy] We would like to know what changes you have made in your work activities in view of the quite new, often unconventional realities of the times.

[Chumak] Right now we are all learning the art of political influence on various processes in society. This is an especially complicated and delicate matter when we are dealing with law-related agencies, for as you know, both the public prosecutor's office and the courts are independent and are subordinate only to the law and are guided in their actions solely by the law.

This does not mean that we are freeing these governmental agencies from party influence. But we are exercising it through party members in the law-related agencies and via cadre policy. Today, for example, the people in the department are working a great deal on strengthening the prestige and influence of party organizations in the Public Prosecutor's Office, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Ministry of Justice, the Supreme Court of the Ukrainian SSR, and the political officials of the agencies with which we work.

These are interesting and turbulent times. They force us to think, to seek out and study people's thoughts. We get together with ranking officials and secretaries of the party committees of law enforcement components to

draft a platform, so that we can combat crime and other negative phenomena in society not on the basis of each man for himself but through joint efforts.

And every day we are faced with new tasks—both long-term tasks and immediate ones. For example, an educated young woman in Belaya Tserkov went to work in a trade enterprise. She had barely gotten started with her new job when an attempt was made to draw her into shady dealings. And when she refused to go along, they made every effort to put her into a compromising position, they accused her of taking bribes, and she was even placed under arrest for several days. It is particularly disturbing that police personnel turned out to be involved in this dirty little game.

[Kraslyanskyy] Did you find out about this from a citizen complaint?

[Chumak] During a personal interview. This also is a very important part of our work. We have calculated that each person in the department deals with more than 100 letters from working people each year, and we do not ignore a single one of these; we respond to every letter, frequently with a visit to the locality in question, for a lip-service response makes a person feel insulted, produces resentment, undermines faith in justice, and damages the authority and prestige of Soviet bodies.

[Kraslyanskyy] Arkadiy Stepanovych, hundreds of citizens come to your offices. Are you able to look into how things worked out for people after you talk with them?

[Chumak] I cannot help it—I never forget about a person who has been the victim of injustice, who has received offense, once that person has come to me for help. One person's sensitivity toward another, concern for a comrade's misfortunes is one of the most valuable traits of our society. And we must understand such a person, put ourselves in his place, and do everything we can to make sure that this person leaves us with a load off his heart.

Unfortunately we are unable to ensure that the principle of presumption of innocence operates flawlessly in society. One still sees indications of the old times, when law enforcement agencies did not show much concern for the law if a person came under suspicion. Today law enforcement agencies are relentlessly weeding out those personnel who do not wish to bring their actions into conformity with the requirements of socialist rule of law or who deliberately commit violations of the law, thus jeopardizing the title of worker in the militia, public prosecutor's office, or the courts.

[Kraslyanskyy] Arkadiy Stepanovych, I would like to ask one last question which applies personally to me and my colleagues. In the course of looking into complaints and statements by citizens received by the editors, on numerous occasions law enforcement agencies, especially oblast and republic public prosecutor's office officials, have done everything they can to prevent reporters from

gaining access to information pertaining to criminal matters. What do you think about this? How should glasnost be applied in such cases?

[Chumak] As for relations between law enforcement personnel and the press, I should like to say the following: the campaign to strengthen rule of law and legal order is our common cause. And an important role in this should be played by the press, which helps party, soviet, and law enforcement agencies uncover shortcomings and disseminate positive experience, and helps form public opinion. I should like to warn journalists, however, against hasty conclusions in assessing the actions of the public prosecutor's office and the courts, and I should like to appeal to them to make a more thorough study of such matters and thoroughly to analyze the facts and positions of both sides. And it is absolutely intolerable for a newspaper or magazine writer to run ahead of events and present his judgments prior to completion of an investigation or prior to court sentencing. As for allowing a reporter access to a case which has been completed, that is, closed or tried in court, in conditions of glasnost and democracy this is a quite normal thing today.

And I should like to say one more thing. Members of the press often come out in defense of the rights of citizens against whom criminal charges are being brought or have been brought. Much less frequently do they talk about the rights of victims and the obligations of our citizens as stated by the Constitution. But rights and obligations are the two equal wings which support our society. It is our sacred obligation to look after this harmonious unity.

Criminal Investigator Describes Fight Against Organized Crime

18000118 Riga SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH
in Russian 4 Oct 88 p 3

[Interview with Police Major Yu. Popov, Latvian MVD Criminal Investigations Bureau, by Alla Berezovskaya: "Protection? And Assault As Well"; date and place not specified]

[Text] We reported previously that a special department has been created in the Latvian MVD to wage the struggle against organized crime. We asked Police Major Yu. Popov of the Criminal Investigations Bureau to tell us about the operation and mission of the new service.

[Berezovskaya] Yuriy Yakovlevich, to begin with, why don't we define organized crime? Until recently this term was not really used here...

[Popov] Perhaps the term is new, but the phenomenon is an old one. It's just that now we have begun to call a spade a spade in a lot of areas—although today in the legal sense we do not have such a judicial concept as "organized crime." There are groups, criminal groups, etc. I think these are also a form of organized crime. Groups of professional apartment thieves, for example,

where each individual has his own clearly defined responsibilities—collecting information, planning and conducting the theft, providing security, maintaining contact with buyers of stolen goods, and selling the items. Characteristic of all types of groups is the fact that the crime organizers, as a rule, remain in the background. Participants in the crime who remain free aid those who have gone to jail. How? These groups have a special fund set up, into which they regularly deposit a percentage of their illegal profits. The money is used for bribing witnesses and other necessary expenses. In our experience we frequently see instances where witnesses or victims all of a sudden repudiate their testimony in court. And we know that money or threats have played a role here.

[Berezovskaya] I remember a press conference with MVD representatives at which a discussion arose concerning providing protection to defendants and the need—as early as the detention and inquiry stage—to get lawyers involved. At which time Deputy Minister Yu. S. Astakhov raised the question of reliable legal protection for victims and witnesses. This was a rather unexpected turn.

[Popov] But entirely justifiable. You will admit that there have been frequent reports in the press lately regarding violations of the rights of the accused—and this is sometimes the case. But far more often we see not a lesser, but perhaps a greater degree of protection required by the aggrieved party himself. Just imagine that they've robbed somebody blind, taken away everything he had collected and accumulated all his life. We detain and expose the criminal. But we do not manage to find anything, as a rule, during a search. The court awards him a prison sentence during which he pays out a certain amount of money to the victim. But big lawsuits are in fact not compensated for. In other words, the criminal goes almost unpunished in a monetary sense. Getting out of prison after 3-5 years, he procures the valuables which have been hidden quite securely in a secret location. In my opinion we must place the interests of the victim above those of the criminal. It is not worth it to give him a long sentence—let him stay in jail some prescribed length of time, then have him work off the rest until he has compensated completely for the loss or damage. Then the convicted embezzler will have a financial interest in providing swift reimbursement for the harm he has caused...

[Berezovskaya] That is certainly an interesting idea. But, Yuriy Yakovlevich, we have digressed somewhat from our main topic. The way I understand it, the mission of the newly created department is not just to fight groups of apartment thieves. It is to fight the Mafia. Here is another new term for us, a phenomenon admitted to exist only rather recently.

[Popov] Yes, the main function of this department will be to fight against corruption and bring to light instances where criminal elements have become intertwined with

police and other agencies sworn to uphold the law. Certainly some work in this direction has already been accomplished. Many people probably recall the affair surrounding the Burilinaya murder. The circumstances of that affair brought to light many criminal activities related to bribery of responsible officials and misappropriation. Even people working in the internal affairs organs were charged with criminal activity, for abuse of official position and other crimes. Criminals in the Kuryshv group are now serving out their punishment. During the course of a year, this group of five operated not only in Latvia, but in other regions of the country as well. Basically they attacked people who were trying to sell "Vneshtorg" checks, or wholesalers in the narcotics trade, i.e., they would purchase some small amount of checks or drugs and reach an agreement on acquiring a greater amount. Then they would attack the "sellers" as robbers would do. These criminals carried firearms.

[Berezovskaya] And the investigation of these matters is probably complicated by the fact that those who have been assaulted do not always report the incident to police. Apparently they are afraid they themselves will have to explain how they received certain revenue, which does not always turn out to be legal...

[Popov] There have been incidents where we established that a crime was committed but the victims categorically denied it. And without a statement it is not always possible to expose a criminal matter. But more often people are silent under the influence of threats. Prosecution of the Komarnitskiy group is currently underway—more than 10 individuals are charged. Almost all of them are sportsmen, karate enthusiasts, trained athletes in excellent physical shape. According to our data, from 1985 through 1987 this group was engaged in extorting money from well-to-do people under a variety of pretexts. For example, they took one citizen out into the woods and thoroughly beat him up. Then they forced him to sign a promissory note for a large sum of money under threat of punishment or reprisal against either him or members of his family. Another victim was forced to provide the "sportsmen" general authorization for use of a motor vehicle. It has been established that there were more than 15 victims, but a few of them refused to make statements. Even now with the judicial process in progress, buddies of the accused are not sitting idly by. As a result, again we see a refusal to testify or provide information at a preliminary hearing... One of these buddies, a certain Yerzin, was arrested not too long ago for attempting to coerce victims and witnesses into changing their statements.

[Berezovskaya] Yes, apparently our legislation needs supplementary provisions, specifically with respect to establishing criminal responsibility for belonging to criminal associations and organizing criminal activity. And here we must make provisions for legal protection from the Mafia of witnesses and victims.

[Popov] I believe this will be reflected in changes to the criminal code presently being prepared. For example, these "thimbles" players bother pretty much everyone—fairly solid groups of people are engaged in this business. We know who the organizers and ringleaders are. They are often detained but...only to receive a 50-ruble fine—that is the extent of administrative responsibility for such activity. But 50 rubles is just seconds of work for a skilled "thimble" (who always has his marble between his fingers). We chase them out of "Start"—so they go off to the Riga House of Furniture or some other place. The Latvian SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs appealed to the Supreme Soviet of the republic, requesting that criminal responsibility be established for such "games." By the way, such a situation already exists in a number of southern republics. This is why many players have streamed into Riga.

[Berezovskaya] Yuriy Yakovlevich, recently the so-called automobile Mafia was exposed...

[Popov] Yes, this group of automobile swindlers operated over a two-year period, basically around the commission store for "Start" automobile sales. Young people were the choice entity here—those with repeated convictions, basically not having worked anywhere. On the other hand, they all participated actively in sports. They were good swimmers, good runners (an important qualification for them); generally speaking they flexed their muscles. Taking note of an appropriate individual selling an automobile, they would make an arrangement on a small sum of money in order to pay less commission duty, and promise to pay the rest later. For example, a Volkswagen owner would appraise his car at 2500 rubles, but the arrangement would be based on 10,000. The "buyer" handed over the money, but when the owner left the store, two hefty young men would come up and twist his arms, grab the money, get into the car and drive off. Then you try to prove the involvement of the "buyer" and he assures you that he handed all the money over. During the course of this investigation, we uncovered more than 40 episodes of crime. The group had ties to automobile store employees and people in the police department.

[Berezovskaya] LITERATURNAYA GAZETA reported recently that there were several cooperatives which had felt "the long hands" of the Mafia and were being subjected to racketeering and blackmail. How real is this threat?

[Popov] The situation is rather serious. Groups have in fact appeared in Riga which are blackmailing cooperatives and people, working individuals, with the aim of extorting money. Often the management of a cooperative is forced under pressure and threats from these groups to accept an individual from the group into its ranks. He is involved in all the transactions involving receipts and expenditures, and at the same time prompts these cooperatives into making various moves. The logic is simple—to get the cooperatives involved in criminal

activity and take everything out of their control... There have also been instances of racketeering. The beat up cooperative personnel who refused to pay off the racketeers. Today we are investigating criminal activity on the part of a group, two of whom have already been arrested. But we would be able to accomplish a great deal more if the cooperative personnel themselves got involved and immediately came to see us. I think the activities of criminal groups are directed towards undermining the cooperative movement. Our overall task, therefore, is to protect the cooperatives from the rackets as well. And as we all know, the best defense is a good offense.

9768

Latvian Internal Affairs Minister Examines History of CID

*18000128 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
5 Oct 88 p 2*

[Interview with Major General B. Ya. Shteynbrik, Latvian SSR Minister of Internal Affairs, on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the organization of the Criminal Investigation Division, by SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA correspondent V. Vilks: "Always on the Forward Edge"; date and place not specified]

[Text] On 5 October 1918 the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs of the young Soviet state adopted the "Provision on the Organization of Criminal Investigation Divisions." Over the 70-year period that has followed, criminal investigation has had a great and glorious history, protecting the interests of the people from criminal encroachment. Today it accomplishes its difficult and responsible missions under conditions of democratization of society, widespread glasnost, and an all-encompassing, unfailing observation of socialist legality.

In conjunction with this famous date in the history of our law-safeguarding agencies, our SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA correspondent has conducted an interview with Major General B. Ya. Shteynbrik, Latvian SSR Minister of Internal Affairs.

[Vilks] Bruno Yakovlevich, prior to your appointment as minister you spent almost three years as head of the Main Administration for Criminal Investigation of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs. How would you characterize the role and place of this service within the system of internal affairs organs?

[Shteynbrik] Criminal investigations is our main service. Its people are always on the forward edge of the battle against crime. Their work is difficult and sometimes dangerous, requiring composure and outstanding courage in addition to professional skills and knowledge. The entire history of Soviet criminal investigations provides a clear confirmation of this. The backbone of the service

has been and remains today individuals who are dedicated to the party and people, honest and courageous individuals capable of remaining true to their mission to the end.

With respect to history, I recall that the first chief of the Main Police Administration of the RSFSR was Riga Bolshevik A. M. Dizhbit, party member since 1912, who accomplished a great deal towards the establishment of criminal investigation.

Following the restoration of Soviet power in our republic in 1940, we can count among the organizers of the leading police service G. A. Rezgl, E. E. Virsis, I. I. Tsirulis, and many others. They did not always have experience, but they worked selflessly and achieved a sharp reduction in crime.

During the war years Latvian police personnel fought the enemy in the ranks of the 201st Latvian Infantry Division, which later became the 43d Guards Division, and in partisan detachments. In 1944, when Latvia was still being liberated from the German Fascist invaders, Colonel R. E. Kalkis, an old Bolshevik and comrade-in-arms of F. E. Dzerzhinskiy, was appointed head of criminal investigations of the Latvian People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs. The investigators not only had to fight criminal elements, but also participate in the struggle to eliminate banditry. We remember our veterans, former front-line soldiers, for whom the war did not end on Victory Day—L. V. Lartman, V. Yu. Balodis, A. G. Naumov, V. M. Shikalov, I. D. Skorin, and others.

Today criminal investigations personnel operate in close contact with the services of the Struggle Against Embezzlement of Socialist Property and Speculation and investigative services engaged in the protection of social order. They are assisted by State Automobile Inspection and other services which, figuratively speaking, conduct the attack along the main axis.

I would especially stress the importance of our reliance on the public. People's units [druzhinniki] and labor collectives of enterprises and farms actively assist criminal investigations personnel and the police as a whole.

[Vilks] The anniversary provides an occasion to sum things up. How would you evaluate the situation in Latvia today?

[Shteynbrik] Our achievements have been modest up until now—there is nothing particular to boast about, although there has been a decrease in instances of major crime, for example. The situation remains rather complicated, which can be explained by a number of reasons. It is more difficult to investigate criminals today. They have the newest types of cars, use various aspects of modern technology, and are familiar with our methods of operation to some degree. They have developed their

own "brain centers" which attempt to take advantage of imperfections in our laws and discover loopholes. They study criminal science literature.

There is also the fact that far from all those who have served out punishments begin again to work honestly. Many granted amnesty have had to return to prison for new crimes they have committed.

Nonetheless, in Ventspils, Aluksnenskiy and Limbazhskiy rayons, we have succeeded in reducing crime, and in Yurmala, Rezeknenskiy, Līvīpayskiy and Ogrskiy rayons, exposure has increased noticeably.

[Vilks] Apparently everything depends on your personnel and how the criminal investigation effort is organized. Is this correct?

[Shteynbrik] Of course. The effort must be organized with precision and modern methods used—not stereotyped ones. Every operational agent must be well versed in the law, professionally well trained and able to use the technical equipment. He must show inventiveness, I would say. Additionally, he should possess high social standards and respect the rights and dignity of citizens. Many of our criminal investigations personnel have higher education or are enrolled in correspondence courses at higher educational institutions.

Recently a branch of the Minsk advanced school of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs was opened in Latvia. We are going to train our own cadre of qualified detectives from among the young people living in the republic who speak both Russian and Latvian. We consider this qualification very important. These people will have closer ties with the population and the interests of our republic will be closer to them.

[Vilks] Discussion took place at the 19th All-Union Party Conference concerning the beginning of a great effort to strengthen the foundations of the socialist legal state, to guarantee supremacy of the law in all aspects of social life. How will this broad legal reform be reflected in criminal investigations activity?

[Shteynbrik] Reform will demand stricter still observance of socialist legality. We see a strengthening of prevention, anticipatory and precautionary measures, especially among those who have not had a serious encounter with the law but display a proneness to legal infraction.

In addition, new criminal and criminal lawsuit codes are currently being developed. These will emphasize punishments not involving prison terms for individuals who have violated the law for the first time, especially for minors who commit crimes, whom it is not always necessary to isolate from society. At the same time we propose to punish repeat offenders more severely. I must

state, however, that severity of punishment has never led to crime reduction, a fact confirmed down through the centuries. The most important factor is the inevitability of punishment.

Humanizing the laws does not mean introducing universal permissiveness. We must see to it that not a single crime goes unexposed. At the same time, we must strengthen ties with labor collectives and with the public. We must enhance the role of inspection with regard to activities of minors.

[Vilks] We have seen a great deal of material in the press in recent years concerning negative phenomena in internal affairs agencies—bribery, arbitrariness, abuse of rights, incompetence and lack of conscientiousness in the work place. Former minister Shchelokov, his first deputy Churbanov, heads of internal affairs agencies in Uzbekistan and Rostovskaya Oblast—and not only these—have inflicted considerable harm and damage to the authority of the police. And people tend to generalize when it comes to flagrant, appalling instances. Has this had an effect on the prestige of the criminal investigations profession?

[Shteynbrik] Without a doubt it has had an effect. The romantic tint of the profession has faded somewhat. It is difficult to gain the respect and confidence of the people, but easy to lose it. But I will note that criminal investigations detectives in our republic have not tarnished themselves with bribery or ties to criminal elements. Diseases of our past included covering up certain crimes and illegitimate actions while detaining a suspect. We have gotten rid of those who discredited the police profession and severely punish such offenses. We do see recurrences of the old diseases, however, and we do not hide them from the public.

[Vilks] During the years of stagnation it was asserted that there was no organized crime, no professional criminals in our country. As it turns out, a desired state of affairs was being perceived for the actual. What is your view on this?

[Shteynbrik] Organized crime exists, unfortunately. True, it is not widespread in our republic but we cannot close our eyes to this. A special unit is being created in our ministry for waging the struggle against organized crime, firstly by exposing stable criminal groups engaged in thefts and burglaries and stealing cars. We see some indications of attempts by criminal elements to engage in rackets, gross blackmail and extortion under threat of force against cooperatives and individuals with unearned income. Criminal investigations must examine these cases jointly with the Struggle Against Embezzlement of Socialist Property and Speculation service.

Generally, in my opinion, we should carefully look into whether or not organized crime was engendered by the period of stagnation or have new social and economic conditions appeared today which are feeding this element?

I will say this about professional crime—if we convict an individual several times for theft, if he doesn't work anywhere, if his basic means of existence is based on selling his stolen goods, then, obviously, you cannot call such an individual anything but a professional criminal. But we have citizens who have served out five, six or more terms of punishment for misappropriation and embezzlement of state and private property.

[Vilks] What areas of criminal investigation activity today do you consider to be most important?

[Shteynbrik] We must, first of all, resolutely solve the problem of juvenile crime. One out of every five criminals is a minor. Law-breakers "are getting younger"—there is an increase in crime committed by 14- and 15-year-olds, and there has been no decrease among 16- and 17-year-olds. This is quite alarming.

A second very important area of emphasis is our struggle against recurring crimes.

A great deal of time and effort goes into our fight against theft of government and personal property. Apartment and store theft, stealing automobiles and removing parts from them in short supply—these are crimes which are difficult to expose. We will never be able to convince citizens that they cannot have a carefree, trusting attitude with regard to casual or chance acquaintanceships, that they must not leave apartment doors and windows unlocked or hide their keys under the mat. People do not care to install alarm systems in their apartments and garages, and they don't park their cars in protected areas unless these are right near where they live. All of this adds to the work which must be done in criminal investigations.

[Vilks] Along with organized crime we also tried in the past not to notice drugs and toxic substance abuse. How widespread is this evil?

[Shteynbrik] It should not be overestimated, but neither can we fail to take note of it. We have created units to deal with the fight against drugs abuse. A number of criminal groups have been exposed in the past two years engaged in manufacturing, storing and selling narcotics. But we are alarmed even more by toxic substance abuse—the use of various tablets and aerosols which have a mind-numbing effect. It is chiefly our young people, minors, who are involved in toxic substance abuse.

Here we see a direct link with poor organization of socially useful employment of teenagers and, without a doubt, with the sharp drop in sales of alcoholic beverages. Juveniles used to "get high" on cheap wine. Getting numb through the abuse of tablets and aerosols is a greater evil still.

The fight against alcoholism, primarily through bans and restrictions on the sale of alcohol, has given rise not only to toxic substance abuse, but also to an unprecedented epidemic of home-brewed concoctions and vodka profiteering. Contrary to expectations, the introduction of a coupon system for sugar failed to bring about any noticeable reduction in the illegal production of alcoholic beverages, but theft of sugar and yeast from stores and enterprises became more frequent.

[Vilks] With advance of glasnost and democratization there arose an entirely new problem—maintaining social order at rallies and demonstrations, today such frequent occurrences.

[Shteynbrik] This is a problem not directly related to criminal investigations activity. But I must say that the rallies in which many people take part attract the attention of criminal elements. We have seen instances of wallets and purses stolen from rally participants. People who use toxic substances in the form of swallowed pills show a defiant attitude towards police personnel and provoke disturbances. So all of our services have enough work on their hands. We are obligated to put a stop to outrages and violations of social order in accordance with laws currently in effect and the resolutions of ispolkoms of local soviets.

[Vilks] Our newspaper publishes weekly reports of the Latvian SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs press corps. It is not often, true, but we also publish materials on the activities of internal affairs agencies. Perhaps we do not do enough of this?

[Shteynbrik] We would be interested in seeing broader publication of our efforts. We ourselves should provide journalists with suggestions on what should be published. But I would think that you do not need our assistance in finding subject areas for critical articles. You should write more about people, about good employees. Insofar as our conversation today deals with criminal investigations, I might call your attention to P. Ya. Naglis, chief of the Madonskiy Rayon internal affairs branch, and senior operations agents F. D. Delikatnyy, of the Moskovskiy Raispolkom in Riga, and A. A. Yaroshevskiy, from the criminal investigations administration of our ministry. You can find people deserving of a word of praise in every section. And don't forget the inspectors in juvenile affairs. Report as well about our helpers, the people's *druzhina*. Then too it is necessary to dispel the various preposterous rumors that sometimes arise, to keep the population reliably informed. We will gladly provide necessary information to journalists.

[Vilks] Thank you for your comments.

Uzbek Supreme Court Admits Mistakes; Promises Reforms

18000246 Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian
21 Nov 88 p 4

[Article by P. Khabibullayev, Chairman of the Presidium of the UzSSR Supreme Soviet and L. Bekkulbekova, Secretary of the Presidium of the UzSSR Supreme Soviet: "Decree of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet: On the Performance of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Court"]

[Text] Having heard and discussed the report of the chairman of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Court, comrade S. Yigitliyyev, concerning the activity of the court, the Supreme Soviet of the Uzbek SSR notes that the highest judicial organ of the republic, guided by the resolutions of the 27th CPSU Congress, and the 19th All-Union Party Conference, has made some progress in administering justice and providing judicial supervision of the activity of the oblast and peoples' courts, reinforcing socialist law and order, and increasing protection of the rights and legitimate interests of the citizenry.

The measures undertaken in the republic to overcome existing negative phenomena have focused on intensifying the struggle against white collar and industrial crime, corruption, unearned income, and criminal recidivism. The Supreme Court's appeal and supervisory activity increased markedly, many previous judicial errors were discovered and governing interpretations developed and issued concerning important categories of criminal activity and also certain aspects of the penal process. Goal-directed measures were undertaken in the effort to develop positive trends in the courts' setting of criminal penalties to accord with conditions of increasing humanization, democracy and glasnost. As a result, the number of individuals sentenced to incarceration decreased from 44.3 percent in 1985 to 30.8 percent in 1988. The number of individuals sentenced to short-term incarceration decreased and punishments providing alternatives to incarceration began to be used more frequently.

At the same time, the Supreme Soviet of the Uzbek SSR finds that the activity of the UzSSR Supreme Court in increasing judicial supervision and administering justice in the republic have not yet become effective and are insufficient to accord with the revolutionary reform that is occurring in this country. The performance of the Supreme Court and the lower courts still contains instances of excessive bureaucracy and formalism, and incorrect application of laws. The instances of unjustified convictions of citizens and cases tied up in red tape in the courts have not decreased. Criminal cases were frequently repeatedly transferred from one court to others, leading to justified complaints.

The significant number of erroneous decisions the Supreme Court's Judicial Board for Criminal Cases makes during appeals and supervisory reviews is not conducive to the courts' uniform application of the legislation in force. The number of errors committed in

considerations of cases under appeal or protest increased by a factor of nearly four during the reporting period. This confuses the lower courts and significantly delays the appropriate resolution of cases.

Many violations of the law committed by the oblast, and Tashkent city courts were corrected by the Supreme Court not during appeals, but in the course of judicial supervision, when the legal consequences of the errors committed had increased significantly. The leadership of the Supreme Court underestimates the importance of the higher court reviewing criminal and civil cases in courts of first instance; the number of such reviews decreased by a factor of two during the reporting period. Cases which have been in the lower courts for a long period of time without correct resolution and cases concerning the organization of criminal groups are rarely accepted for hearing by the Supreme Court.

The absence of special prophylactic work to prevent violations of the law by the courts of the republic in the cases they try has caused the stability of their rulings to decrease continually in recent years. While in 1985, the decisions of oblast and equivalent courts overturned by the Supreme Court on appeal was 6.4 percent, in 1986 this indicator increased by almost a factor of two, and reached 21 percent in 1987. Overturning of judicial decisions and decrees in appeals of civil cases occurred at a rate of 23.5 percent in 1985, 16.8 percent in 1987, and 19.7 percent in the first half of 1988.

Recently there was an increase in the total number of rulings of the boards overturned or substantially altered by the presidium of the Supreme Court. In 1985, 53 rulings of the board for criminal cases were overturned; in 1987 this figure had reached 152. In the first half of 1988, the number of overturned rulings increased to 77, as compared to 54 in the corresponding period of last year. During the past three and a half years, rulings were significantly altered in 237 cases, and a total of 551 errors committed by the board for criminal cases were corrected. During the same period, 12 judicial decrees issued by the board for civil cases were partially or completely altered. The judicial staffs of the boards work in isolation, and formal meetings for substantive discussion of the errors they committed are held only extremely rarely.

These shortcomings in the performance of the Supreme Court of the republic are due, to a significant extent, to the poor organization of the work of its structural subdivisions and to inadequate monitoring by the presidium and leadership. Analytic work to study and draw generalizations from judicial practice is also inadequate. The quality of the governing interpretations is also low; they do not deal with the most urgent issues that arise when economic reforms are implemented, or in the further development of cooperative and individual work, or in the resolution of other problems related to the development of a uniform legal policy governing the activities of the republic's courts under conditions of

perestroyka. In its practice, the highest judicial organ issues specific rulings, as a rule, only when it is considering specific cases as the court of first instance and there is virtually no monitoring of the reaction to them.

Serious shortcomings continue to occur in the activities of the the Supreme Court Presidium. In 1987 and the first half of 1988, the plenum of the Supreme Court overturned illegal decrees by the presidium with regard to nine individuals, and in two instances the case was dismissed. The careless attitude to their duties on the part of certain members of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Court, their superficial study of their cases and verification of the arguments put forth in appeals, their uncritical evaluation of the evidence, their violations of the law, regulations, and procedures for reviewing criminal cases under appeal have led to multiple reversals and alterations of appeal and supervisory rulings.

The supreme court often does not react properly to changes on the part of witnesses and those who have testified in court. Frequently, as a result of superficial knowledge of the case and one-sided evaluation of the accumulated evidence contradictory rulings are issued on one and the same case.

On the whole, the leadership of the republic's Supreme Court (comrades S.Y. Yigitaliyev, A.V. Dobronravov, and O.A. Khaydarova) and the chairmen of the judicial boards (comrades U.K. Mingbayev and M.A. Alimdzhanova) have not yet restructured work with personnel in accordance with current requirements. They have not succeeded in stabilizing the court staffs, or in attaining an optimal combination of young and experienced workers. During the two last and a half years after the elections, 11 members of the court were deprived of their authority before their terms expired for various reasons, while seven of them had worked in the Supreme Court for less than three years. The plans developed by the Supreme Court jointly with the Ministry of Justice of the Uzbek SSR for retraining members of the oblast court are purely formal and take no account of the professional levels of these workers. The permissive attitude toward workers of the court, excessive tolerance of shortcomings and misuse of official positions, the absence of the vigilance required has led to a situation in which morally dissolute and dishonest workers have occupied official posts, corrupting the high goals and objectives of the judicial organs. The work of the clerical and technical staffs is not monitored, leading to the most blatant violations of the laws concerning acceptance, completion, and disposition of executable judicial documents. There have been many instances of formalism and callousness in review of complaints and declarations by citizens, violations of the stipulated timetable for considering them, and the need for repeated complaints. As a result judicial errors go uncorrected for long periods of time.

The Supreme Court of the Uzbek SSR does a poor job of coordinating its operations with the law enforcement organs of the republic, and does not make sufficient use of the right of legislative initiative.

The Supreme Soviet of the Uzbek SSR decrees:

1. The report of the Supreme Court of the Uzbek SSR on its activity from March 1985 to October of 1988 will be taken into consideration.

2. It is noted that the work of the Supreme Court of the Uzbek SSR is still not appropriate to the goals of ensuring socialist law and order and increasing protection of the rights and legitimate interests of the citizenry.

The attention of the chairman of the Supreme Court of the Uzbek SSR, comrade S.Y. Yigitaliyev, and of his deputies, comrades A.V. Dobronravov and O.A. Khaydarova, is directed to the serious omissions in their work to implement justice, and on the slow elimination of the shortcomings that marked the performance of the courts during the years of stagnation.

3. The Supreme Court of the Uzbek SSR must:

- undertake the measures necessary to raise the level and effectiveness of administration of justice in the republic. The chief focus of this work must be on preventing commission of judicial errors, violations of laws by the courts, enterprises, and institutions and on the observance of socialist law and the principles of Soviet legal proceedings;
- support high quality work by the plenum and judicial boards to intensify supervision of the activities of the courts of the Uzbek SSR;
- improve analytical work to achieve in-depth understanding and interpretation of judicial practice so as to provide timely identification of the most characteristic miscalculations and shortcomings in the work of the courts in order to eliminate them, and to increase the effectiveness of judicial activity in the fight against crime;
- regularly send the courts governing interpretations on issues of application of republic legislation, and use them to help to increase the level of administration of justice; orient the courts to the most sensitive approach to sentencing criminals, taking into account the changes introduced into criminal legislation. Increase the quality and effectiveness of the governing interpretations and enlist the help of scholars and practitioners from law enforcement agencies in their preparation;
- increase review of the legality and justification of sentences and decisions of lower courts, increase the responsibility of every member of the court for implementation of justice. Adopt an approach based on principles to each instance in which a citizen is illegally charged with a crime. Help the courts to critically analyze material from preliminary hearings and evaluate them correctly.

Raise the work of the disciplinary boards of the Supreme Court to the required level.

4. The Supreme Court and the Ministry of Justice of the Uzbek SSR must: continuously improve the work of the rayon, city and oblast courts in providing timely and high-quality settlement of criminal and civil cases, executing judicial decisions, increasing the educational significance of judicial processes, and disseminating propaganda in favor of Soviet legislations; give the courts the necessary help in implementing their authority; constantly concern themselves with raising the professional level of the judicial staff and improving their work with reserve work forces.

5. The leadership of the Supreme Court of the Uzbek SSR must pay particular attention to the selection, training, and education of members of the Supreme Court. Before they are recommended for positions, the professional and moral qualities of candidates must be thoroughly studied, their practical work systematically evaluated, and advanced training provided. The quality of retraining of judicial specialists must be improved and their work must continue to be monitored in order to prevent them from violating the law.

6. The Supreme Court, Ministry of Justice, and Ministry of Internal Affairs, working jointly with the Uzbek SSR Procurator's Office, must improve coordination of joint activity in the fight against crime, and its prevention, and also in improvement of legal instruction of citizens and developong respect for Soviet laws.

7. The Supreme Soviet of the Karakalpak ASSR, the oblast and Tashkent city Councils of Peoples' Deputies must increase the role of the courts as elective organs, regularly hear their reports at their sessions, strengthen the ties of judges and peoples' assessors with labor collectives, and assist them in the creation of the required housing and living conditions.

8. The Commission on Legislative Proposals of the Supreme Soviet of the Uzbek SSR is assigned to critically study the remarks and proposals expressed by the deputies during their discussion of the report on the activity of the Supreme Court of the Uzbek SSR and, when necessary, introduce the appropriate motions at the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Uzbek SSR.

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Uzbek SSR must consider the issue of strengthening guidance of the Supreme Soviet of the Uzbek SSR.

**Readers Blast Leadership of 'Pamyat',
'Democratic Union'**

18000243 Moscow *VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA*
in Russian 23 Nov 88 p 3

[Article by Yu. Kazarin and A. Russovskiy: "The Leaders and the Pug Dogs: Scandals in 'Noble Families'"]

[Text] They consider themselves respectable, almost sacred: "Pamyat," calling itself a national-patriotic front

and claiming the role of the "worldwide warrior against Zionist-Masonry," the sole champion of the sterile purity of nations, culture, and history; and the "Democratic Union," a pocket-sized "political party," concocting for itself the mandate to completely deny our whole socialist society, all of our hard-won achievements.

It would seem at first glance that these two organizations have little in common. And that it is just an accident they are both subsumed here under a single heading. However, two xeroxed letters, which arrived at our editorial offices at virtually the same moment, have suddenly disclosed the similarity between them. It appears that these letters are intended for a broad circle of readers. Well, all right, let's read them.

The first letter has the following heading: "Decree of the NPF 'Pamyat'." Alongside is their emblem: a bell with a cross on top. What is the bell pealing about?

It turns out that it is ringing about the fact that "in the last few months, negative tendencies have intensified within the national patriotic front 'Pamyat' and a state of affairs has arisen that has become intolerable." The authors of the letter—and there are about 30 of them, members of the ruling clique—make no attempt to conceal their distress. "Although it is painful to speak about it," they write lachrymously, "the actions of the chairman of the 'Pamyat' front, D. D. Vasilyev are directed at destroying the national-patriotic movement. The following ugly facts have convinced us of this fact.."

Subsequently, D. D. Vasilyev is charged with "uncontrolled use of donations, often quite substantial donations, and concealment of the fact of their receipt, even from the 'Pamyat' council; shameless use of the the financial resources and personal services of members of "Pamyat" for his own personal objectives and personal gain.."

There is more to follow: "While constantly speaking of his own poverty, Vasilyev has made a very comfortable life for himself at the expense of others and is well known as a collector of expensive antique objects, books, medals, etc." In particular, "the fate of the television film about 'Pamyat', which Vasilyev gave to foreign journalists, is unknown, as is how much money he received for this film, where the money is being kept, and how it is being used."

The impression that this gives is that this fellow is not a chairman at all, but a common swindler.

But the signers of this humble petition, his recent companions-in-arms—V. Silkin, N. Filimino, I. Antonov, P. Burov, O. Yeremina, I. Kvartalov, and others—accuse their leader of more than just being unscrupulous and mercenary. It turns out that the chairman is also a blatant usurper. He has surrounded his management actions with "profound secrecy," "encourages people to inform on each other," has created "an atmosphere of moral terror," and, in short, has spit on the central

council of the "front;" without consulting with anyone he has autocratically surrounded himself with "individuals not known to anyone." "Vasilyev has as proteges two dubious characters," write the authors of the letter disapprovingly, "one of whom is an adept and preacher of occult sciences, while the other has a criminal record."

How can we leave at his post at the bell, an individual who does not stick at contacts with emigre circles of "occult-satanist leanings" and who allows foreign journalists to "smoke while sitting before icons, which is blasphemy?" rhetorically ask Vasilev's former colleagues and then proceed to answer themselves. "We announce that D.D. Vasilyev is no longer the chairman of the 'Pamyat' National Patriotic Front, and is removed from his post on the central council, and expelled from membership in the front."

According to the authors of the letter, the central council of 'Pamyat' has been liquidated.

As they say, may its memory live forever.

But this is not all. The cited "resolution" was soon followed by an "announcement" which also carried a bell. This time the heading was "Authority of the Leader." It was signed by D. Dugin, G. Dzhemal, A. Gladkov, and others, who immediately take the "bull by the horn" and defend D.D. Vasilyev. "Without a paternal leader people always suffer. They wander aimlessly through life, without a shine in their eyes. Great deeds cannot be done without leaders.... And suddenly, from someone's unsteady hand and weak head the Leader (Vasilyev's defenders write this word thus with a capital letter—Yu.K. & A.R.) has become a common noun...

"For the pug dogs, attempting to howl at the Leader, we again repeat: it is Vasilyev who is responsible for the mass awareness of the struggle against Zionism and Masonry in our country." Leaders and pug dogs—now it is clear what has happened with "Pamyat."

And a little further on, they again return to the subject. "The plots of the enemy are clear. The attempts to get rid of Vasilyev were dictated by a single goal: to remove from consideration on our agenda, the primary evil revealed by the patriots he heads—the operations of the Zionist-Masonic forces in this country and in the world."

The old, threadbare, obsessive idea: down with Zionism and Masonry and all our problems will be solved! What senselessness.

But this is still not all. Accompanied by the funereal peals of "Pamyat," the "leader" has quietly dissolved the so-called central coordinating council of the not unknown "democratic union." What happened in this "noble family?"

The second letter is called "To the Members of the Democratic Union Party."

Along with it is a memorandum. We will begin with it.

It tells a story worthy of a detective novel. A member of the Democratic Union, one Denisov, has a video camera worth 15 thousand rubles. This camera is alleged to have been given to him by Americans for sale and replenishment of the treasury of the Democratic Union.. But our Denisov does not want to replenish the treasury—he wants instead to fill his own pockets. Inviting another "democrat" to share in this enterprise, he has started to look for a buyer in secret from the Democratic Union. However, as is always the case, the secret came out. A. Lukashev acted the part of the unmasker. It looks to us as if a dogfight began among the "democrats."

And here, as was the case with "Pamyat," the first document was followed by a letter. In the "coordinating council," to which its authors, L. Ubozhko, R. Semenov, V. Bogachev, and I. Antonov, belong, a great ruckus arose. The "banners of democracy" were thrown aside, and fists and clubs appeared in their stead.

"We consider it essential to show all the members of the Democratic Union the true faces of power-hungry "leaders," such as V. Novodvorskaya and A. Lukashev." (Note here too we have "leaders." Yu.K. & A.R.)

The appalling demagogery of these people astonishes even themselves. Novodvorskaya, for example, "has a mouth full of pluralism and democratism, but her deeds belie her words."

The authors have a real score to settle with her. "She self-importantly named herself leader," "perpetrated a legal forgery," violates "democratism and pluralism."

The quartet who signed the letter are looking for sympathy in the community: "the most blatant tyranny is in evidence! Anyone voting against her proposals, contrary to her views, became her personal enemy, and on such pretexts she went into hysterics more than once."

Indeed, how can this be accepted—the leader in hysterics? Aside from everything else, she is a "person completely without principles," "where is her human dignity, where is her pride as a woman?"

VECHERNAYA MOSKVA has written more than once about the "theoretical" constructs of V. I. Novodvorskaya and the other "ideologues" of the Democratic Union. We do not want to repeat ourselves. However, this internal (so to speak) evaluation of their "leader" by the members themselves that has suddenly come to light is of some interest.

As the authors of the letter believe, Novodvorskaya's behavior "cannot be explained by anything other than dilettantism and mental limitations, combined with fanaticism and female hysterics."

"Mental limitations..."

And this about a women? Aren't they being rather rude? On the other hand, the authors of the letter are in a better position to know.

"Female hysterics? It also rings true. "After being sentenced to 15 days in prison (and this, as we know, often happens with her.—Yu.K. & A.R.), she not only declared that she would fast, but also called upon the members of the party not experienced in political battle to do the same, without considering either their capacity or their health." What a cruel leader! Granted she is watching her weight, but why should others suffer?

And they don't suffer from hunger alone. One instance described by the authors of the letter is enough to horrify you. Once, talking with E, the mother of one of her "democrats," Novodvorskaya announced that, "Our fatherland is in danger" (do you recall something of this sort with "Pamyat"? Yu.K. & A.R.), and for this reason her son, A., "must perish in the prisons along with her and the other members of the Democratic Union, and not go off to study at Cambridge University, since that would be betraying the Soviet people." In a word, the Democratic Union urgently requires victims; there appears to be a great need for victims!

The very "memorandum" we received is also mentioned in the letter. It turns out that it was written by A.

Lukashev—yet another "leader, who has decided to rid himself of everyone who doesn't suit him with a single stroke." He, furthermore, is a "conceited egoist, and is power mad, a slanderer, liar, and intriguer." One has to admit, these Democratic Union leaders are an interesting group!

It is impossible not to agree with the authors of the letter when they "wish to ask, whether people like this are capable of leading. Only those who are completely without principles and stupid can follow them." These are true words.

And note how the next phrase resonates with the concluding paragraph of the letter from "Pamyat." "We cannot do the same—we do not have the right, and for this reason we consider it impossible to remain in the same party as these scoundrels (this is exactly how it is phrased!—Yu. K. & A. R.) Further on there is some common sense: "We invite every honorable, respectable, principled, thinking member of the Democratic Union to quit this party."

At last! Someone has had a good idea..

9285

Belorussian Unofficial Clubs Deplored

Talaka's Platform Vilified

18000205a Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA
in Russian and Belorussian 22 Oct 88 p 3

[Article signed by N. Dorozhkin, academician of the BSSR Academy of Sciences, USSR State Prize laureate, BSSR Honored Science Worker; A. Bardanov, responsible secretary of the Minsk section of the Soviet Committee of War Veterans, Hero of the Soviet Union; A. Filimonov, chairman of the BSSR Academy of Sciences Council of War and Labor Veterans, doctor of historical sciences, professor, Hero of the Soviet Union; D. Zhmurovskiy, professor of the faculty of CPSU history at the Belorussian State University imeni V.I. Lenin, Hero of the Soviet Union; and K. Domorad, deputy chairman of the veterans council of the Minskaya Oblast Association of Partisans, candidate of historical sciences, docent: "The Evolution of Political Ignorance"]

[Text] If you carefully read the all kinds of "appeals", "calls" and other pearls of the "samizdat" of Talaka and other organizations, which have been disseminated in Minsk in recent times, you come involuntarily to the conclusion that their authors are obviously not in tune with the rudiments of political knowledge or, frequently, with common sense. K. Marx was right when he considered political ignorance to be the greatest of evils, one which possesses a truly demonic strength. It is precisely therefore that, today, the creation of a high level of political culture, along with broad democratization of society, is defined by the party as one of the most important conditions for radical reform of the political system.

If one is to believe Talaka's charter, it was created for the purpose of organizing active participation by the city's young people in the preservation and propaganda of historical and cultural monuments. The association proclaimed its basic tasks to be "study and propaganda by the members of the club of Lenin's ideas concerning preservation of the historical and cultural heritage of the Soviet people, of legislation regarding preservation of monuments; organization and carrying out of work related to the restoration, conservation, and well-organized management of historical and cultural monuments under the direction of specialists; active assistance to state organs for the preservation of monuments in the matter of publicizing, accounting for, and utilizing them..."

As we see, the goals that were established were good and humane ones. However, Talaka soon took an entirely different path. They began to give all sorts of speeches and reports at its meetings and to present specially selected and tendentiously composed slide shows, photo montages, wall newspapers, etc., which create a negative opinion on the part of those present concerning the activities of local councils concerned with the preservation of historical and cultural monuments and with

ecological problems. With increasing frequency, a desire to create and maintain an atmosphere of distrust toward official authorities began to be manifested in the addresses and the "appeals" of its members.

Let us support these charges with facts. We have before us a document called "Ratusha" ["City Hall"]. This is the unique ideological and political platform of today's Talaka. On the title page, the authors remind us that "reprintings must make reference to the original."

In compliance with this desire, we will examine "Ratusha" directly in its original version. It consists of such sections as "The Sovereignty of the Republic", "Economics", "Democratization", "Ecology", "The Nation, Language, and Culture"... When studying this document, we discover with surprise that our homegrown "reformers" have subjected the theses on which Marxist-Leninist theory is founded to a basic shake-up.

Where are those modest "helpers" who in their initial "appeals" and "manifestos" once called upon themselves and others to concern themselves with the preservation and restoration of monuments to history and culture? Perhaps they are working to restore the Upper City, the Troitsk suburb? No! They would teach others how to do this. And behave as if, in the final instance, the truth belongs to them alone.

A grandiose break with obsolete, benumbed ideas is now taking place in our country. A new political way of thinking is being worked out in heated debates and arguments. However, the authors of "Ratusha", despite generally known and obvious facts, do not take notice and do not want to take notice of any kind of new political changes proposed by the party. Prisoners of their own illusions, some members of Talaka are not even turning their attention to what is going on around them. They are interested neither in the new thinking nor in the broad, many-colored palette of new realities in politics and world outlook. Instead of this, they are calling themselves to the aid of the ghosts of bourgeois nationalism that have long been condemned by history and by the entire Belorussian people and they have introduced long decrepit ideological rubbish into their "appeals" and their "city halls".

The "helpers", as they write, would also very much like to do their bit for "the possibility of reestablishing in Belorussia the activities of the Belorussian Autocephalous Orthodox Church and of the Belorussian Greek Catholic (Uniate) Church." Such concern for religious toleration and freedom of conscience on the part of philosophers, aspirants, and assistants looks extremely strange, to say the least. The fact is that the so-called Belorussian "autocephalia" was established in the summer of 1942 as a pro-fascist organization under the guise of the "independence" of the orthodox church. The bloody executioner of the Belorussian people, Gauleiter Kube, gave his blessing to its creation. The Belorussian

Autocephalous Orthodox Church was headed by the traitor and betrayer, Archbishop Filafey. At his suggestion, a telegram with the following content was sent to Hitler.

"In the name of the orthodox of Belorussia, the Belorussian Orthodox Church Council in Minsk, the first of its kind in history, extends to you, Herr Reichskanzler, its heartfelt gratitude for the liberation of Belorussia from the Moscow-Bolshevik atheistic yoke, for making it possible to freely organize our religious life in the form sacred to the Belorussian Orthodox Autocephalous Church, and wishes your invincible forces the quickest possible total victory. [signed] Archbishop Filafey, Bishop Afanasiy, Bishop Stefan" (see the journal *NAUKA I RELIGIYA*, 1988, No. 5)

Incidentally, Talaka is by no means original in its attempts to revitalize the "autocephalia." In December 1949, in the West German city of Rosenheim, former underlings of Hitler—Belorussian nationalists, police officials and burgoameisters, who had fled the peoples courts—proclaimed in their own council the "resurrection" of the hierarchy of the Belorussian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (BAOC), comprised of the bishops Sergey and Vasilii and the former fervent Hitler underlings Sergey Okhotenko and Vladimir Tomashchik. It is clear what kind of "love" they felt for our people!

As regards the Uniate Church, whose jurisdiction within the republic the leaders of Talaka are striving so hard to achieve, the following example should be presented. In Belorussia, as is known, this church does not exist. However, it has been "resurrected" in certain countries of the West by those same ubiquitous traitors and collaborators. Incidentally, in June 1986, as its head, that is as the "apostolic visitor of Belorussians in the free world," the Vatican also named a former Hitlerist underling, the fervent anti-communist Aleksandr Nadson (see "Greek Gifts" ["Dary Danaytsev"], Minsk. "Belorussia" [Belarus], 1987, pp 192-272, and also the pamphlet by V. Zhakel entitled "A Curiosity of Fate, or How the Atheist Shura Bochka became an apostolic Visitor" (The newspaper *GOLAS RADZIMY*, Nov 86)

This is the sort of god before whom the "leadership" of Talaka asks you to bow down.

Also more than a little uneasy about "concern" for strengthening the defense capabilities of the republic, they are also struggling to restore the "practice of organizing Belorussian military units, in which service would take place in the Belorussian language." It will surely be of some interest to the reader to learn who it was that earlier wanted in this same way to strengthen the "defense capabilities" of Belorussia. In F. Turuk's book "The Belorussian Movement" (Moscow, 1921), it is told how, back in December 1917, the SR's tried to establish so-called "Belorussian troops" from the Belorussian soldiers on the Romanian front. Subsequently, as the weekly newspaper *BELARUSKAYE ZHYTSTSYE* reported (7 Nov 1919),

this attempt was repeated by the Belorussian bourgeois nationalists together with the White Polish invaders. We will quote the newspaper: "The chairman of the military commission, P. Aleksyuk, in his address, noted the enormous importance which will belong to this young army which, in the name of the Belorussian ideal, is supposed to decisively defend the people of its native land from the enemies of Belorussia, whether they be disguised as Bolsheviks or disguised as imperialists. The Belorussian people should recall that the foundation for our armed forces was laid due to the great statesmanship of the leader of a fraternal state of ours, Joseph Pilsudski, and let the Belorussian soldiers know that they can go into deadly combat under the command of such a great man, because he, the best son of Poland, is so sincerely assisting the Belorussian people to lay the foundations of their own independent existence."

Yet another attempt to create a "territorial Belorussian military formation" can be recalled. We have in mind the so-called army of the Belorussian central council, or the "Belorussian territorial defence", which the pro-fascist military organization of Belorussian nationalists, headed by the high-executioner and torturer Frantisek Kushel, attempted to establish during the period of Hitler's occupation.

The authors of "Ratusha" are very worried about the sovereignty of the republic. And this is how they view it: "To develop, based on the qualifications of residence and possession of the Belorussian language, the status of republic citizenship." This proposal is reinforced by the requirement "... to guarantee economic privileges to young families having Belorussian citizenship..."

If it is considered that Belorussia lost one out every four of its inhabitants during the years of the Great Fatherland War, and that the rebuilding of the ravaged national economy, which sharply increased requirements for human resources in the postwar period, attracted a large number of representatives of other nationalities to us from all the fraternal republics, and that this was of enormous material assistance to us, then the problem that has been cited takes on an unanticipated aspect. The "expansion of sovereignty" which has been proposed by the "helpers" leads to a situation in which all these so-called "migrants" will end up being residents of Belorussia, but without republic citizenship and, naturally, without "privileges".

One who does not understand the essential, also does not understand and will not accept the particular. Therefore, the following passage by the creators of "Ratusha" will appear entirely natural: "We do not accept the proposal (actually the legislation) to combine the positions of first secretaries of corresponding party committees with the positions of chairmen of the corresponding soviets..."

What can be said on this score? One is involuntarily reminded of the Polish Sejm of the middle ages, when in the face of a generally accepted and universally approved

decision, some arrogant, grand gentleman or another could stand up and declare "We do not permit it!" and, by so doing, could render invalid a law that had only just been passed. But we are living in different times.

It is bitter and painful to once again talk about an almost "pathological" striving to resurrect nationalistic symbols out of nowhere. This has been discussed fully and clearly enough already by the readers of ZVYAZDY in their responses to the article "What do the Talakists Want?" However, the document we are examining once again confirms that this striving does not represent a passing distraction, but a clearly conscious goal. We will quote from "Ratusha": "To demand official recognition of the "Pagonya" coat of arms and the white-red-white banner as national Belorussian symbols." The authors of "Ratusha" are in no way disturbed by the such obvious facts as that "white-red-white banners were carried by the polizei as well as by other Hitler underlings, that the punitive detachments of the "Belorussian Territorial Defense" operated under a "banner of the same colors," and that members of the pro-fascist "Union of Belorussian Youth" wore "Pagonya" badges on their caps. Some members of informal associations might object: Why are you rubbing our noses in facts more than forty years old?

Well, we will also present fresh ones. The "white-red-white banner" and the "Pagonya" are also found today in the service of entrenched Hitlerist hide-outs in the West and abroad and of their spiritual heirs—Belorussian bourgeois nationalists. When gatherings of various reactionary emigrant organizations are held, when all kinds of "anti-Bolshevik blocks" meet and when "days of enslaved peoples" are conducted, this flag and this coat of arms occupy a very visible place; former Hitlerist lackeys and the modern-day landsknechten of the anti-communist "crusades" consider them their own sacred objects. Is this really unknown to the Talaka leaders?

The "friends" from Talaka are particularly excited by the possibility of establishing their own personal press organs. Here, they are not only issuing proclamations, but are also attempting to act. What is more, in a very unique way. Here is a document that is preserved in the procuracy of the city of Minsk. "On 26 March 1988, Yevgeniy Ivashkevich distributed among the citizens of the city of Minsk literature which contains erroneous, politically harmful statements regarding the Soviet state structure and the nationalities policy that is being pursued within the country, as well as insulting, defamatory statements concerning specific officials." On the basis of Point 7, Article 23 of the Law on the USSR Procuracy, the club activist was warned that in the event of a repetition of similar "individual unauthorized activity," he will be held strictly accountable.

Certainly, it is therefore that the members of Talaka, in their addresses and appeals, so stubbornly defend the thesis that what they understand to be freedom of information is incompatible with the article "existing in

the BSSR Criminal Code" which envisages punishment for "knowing dissemination of untrue fabrications that discredit the state and the social system."

In the interests of justice, it must be said that the leaders of Talaka do not exaggerate their role and place in the so-called "Belorussian national renewal" which they are reinvigorating. Therefore, in their appeals, they are calling upon the "spiritual leadership of the Belorussian people to come forth with an initiative for creation of such a movement."

Whom have they chosen as "spiritual fathers"?

Already on 5 April 1988, the newspaper VECHERNIY MINSK, in an article entitled "Position or Pose," named several pretenders to this role. Discussion then was about a photograph, which showed the Talaka activists S. Vitushka, the brothers Yevgeniy and Viktor Ivashkevichi, A. Radkevich, S. Lobach, and others, along with Yurka and Leon Lutskevichi. The service records of the Lutskevichi brothers were printed on the pages of the paper. They wrote, in particular, about their father—Anton Lutskevichi—a prominent Belorussian bourgeois nationalist, one of the leaders of the anti-popular council of the BNR [expansion not given], who faithfully served first the German Kaiser and then the "Head of the Polish State", Joseph Pilsudski.

Therefore, we will limit ourselves to extracts from the 3 November 1982 response of the military procuracy of the Belorussian Military District to a request by Yu. A. Lutskevichi for rehabilitation: "In fact, you reached the decision to leave for East Prussia independently, and then voluntarily entered into service with the Hitlerists in the intelligence and sabotage school of the Abwehr. While serving as a propaganda officer and adjutant to the chief of this school, from the fall of 1944 to the capitulation of fascist Germany, you were actively engaged in the recruitment and ideological indoctrination of spies and saboteurs dispatched to the Soviet rear and, subsequent to this, fearing punishment for what you had done, you remained to live in Poland under a fictitious name... These traitorous acts of yours were correctly classified as treason to your homeland."

The same path was also taken by Leon. Incidentally, it is specifically he who, having invited a group of future "helpers" to be his guests in Vilnyus in 1985, led them to the city cemetery. Here they all together carried out a unique kind of "help", by fixing up the graves of a number of "activists of the Belorussian national renewal", among them Frantisek Alyakhovich, the former editor of the pro-Hitler newspaper BELARUSKI GOLAS, who was executed by Soviet partisans for his collaboration with the occupation forces.

Meanwhile, trips by the talakists to their "spiritual leaders" in Vilnyus continue right to this day. These are clear evidence of what kind of "idols" the supporters of

restoring Belorussia's historical and cultural monuments are choosing for themselves. Is the grave of the traitor F. Alyakhnovich really also such a monument?

Recently the journal *POLITICHESKOYE OBRAZOVANIYE*, analyzing the activities of certain "informalists", wrote: "...It is important to distinguish these 'children of their times' from the purposeful political adventurers and extremists who, under conditions of democratization and glasnost, are striving to utilize the independent associations for selfish purposes, including political ones. Among them there are people who, for various reasons, are not recognized in official structures and who thirst for the revenge of self-realization and self-assertion in unofficial structures. Certain such 'leaders' deny the value of socialism and are borrowing alternatives to it from the arsenal of bourgeois ideology and politics" ("PO", 1988, No 12, p 60).

In this connection, we will try to give a moral and political characterization of certain such "children of their times"—leaders of Talaka. He have a rather complete picture of one of them—Valentin (or Vintsus, as he now calls himself) Vecherka—a teacher of the Belorussian language at the Minsk Pedagogical Institute imeni A.M. Gorkiy. We have been greatly helped in characterizing him by people who knew him at the university or worked together with him. One cannot avoid a growing conviction regarding the progressively increasing offensiveness of this individual. While still attending an institution of higher education, he was distinguished by his scornful attitude toward contemporaries who did not share his point of view. While a student, he was a ringleader of the so-called "masters". Even then, through his political immaturity and youthful maximalism, the megalomania of this young man was evident.

Now, Vecherka is simply obsessed by the idea of being on top. To be always and everywhere on view, to pass for someone who knows it all, to goad others on—such is his credo, but mainly—to be at the head of any organization. While cloaking himself in a concern about national treasures, he seeks only personal notoriety, self-glorification. Sometimes the impression is created that, as a result of his sick fancies, he sees himself as some sort of leader of a national rebirth. It is precisely this that pushes him into actions which are objectively designed to trample under himself a large number of independent collectives. Meanwhile, Vecherka is conducting a campaign for the renewal of nationalistic symbols. And further?

In addition to snobbism, Vecherka is distinguished by his hypocrisy. He discourses a great deal on restructuring and speaks out against the time of stagnation, although he is a direct product of it and enjoys all its benefits. This is only one side of it. After he had changed over to teaching work, his position as a post-graduate student was immediately taken by his wife. Why, for what services, did such privileges go to one family?

Such, in our view, is the portrait of a candidate "leader of blockheads". At least he, Valentin-Vintsus' Vecherka, does not consider himself to be the brightest "star" on the horizon of the informal associations.

He are not in possession of Talaka's table of organization. And it is possible that we are insulting one of its "leaders" by not placing him in the spot he deserves. Please excuse us if we have become confused in our enumeration.

Ales' Susha (a junior editor in one of the departments of the Belorusskaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya publishing house) is unquestionably one of the "directors" of Talaka. Basically, not a single gathering takes place without his involvement. He, as they say, is an "inveterate orator and theoretician," although nobody has seen his work.

Viktor Ivashkevich, like his brother Yevgeniy, about whom we spoke earlier, did not emerge from the ranks. He was expelled from the Belorussian State University imeni V.I. Lenin for academic failure (even the intervention of an extremely influential father-in-law, Ye. Radkevich—a faculty head at this university—did not help). Therefore, with nothing but free time on his hands, he has an opportunity to devote himself entirely, without anything left over, to "service" to Talaka, willingly making trips beyond the borders of the republic and visiting all the "actions" of the informal associations, generously dispensing television and radio interviews right and left in the name of the "working class of the heroic city of Minsk", although nobody has asked or, much less, authorized him to do so.

A group portrait of the Talaka leadership would be incomplete if we did not mention Sergey Vitushku, a student in the third year of the faculty of history at the Belorussian State University, who has already been listed as an official director of Talaka for about three years. At least he himself considers that he is such. But it seems to us that he is misrepresenting the role he plays and the place he occupies in the game of "patience" that someone is skillfully playing.

In the interests of justice, it should be said that the this ruling "team of four" should not, by any means, be identified with the rank and file members of Talaka, who in fact are really concerned (as, incidentally, are all of the republic's working people) about the need to more carefully preserve and augment the achievements of national culture and who are far removed from what clearly is nationalistic ambitiousness.

However, an assessment of any phenomenon should of course be built not upon private characteristics, but should derive instead from a political analysis of the correlation between declarative announcements and actual practice. This pertains to Talaka as well.

It would be possible to discuss even further the problems of economics, ecology, the nation, language, and culture and to agree with or contest the Talaka's proposals for their solution. But each of the cited problems demands thorough consideration and could by itself serve as the subject of a separate article. Moreover, any discussion will be fruitful only when both sides hear and see one another (or want to hear and see one another) and do not give a "hostile reception" to the smallest "different idea" or even reference to one. The generally known truth that "he that hath ears to hear, let him hear; he that hath eyes to see, let him see" certainly will never go out of date.

Therefore, only political blindness and deafness can explain the fact that, in Talaka, they have heard neither the arguments of veterans gone gray with age, nor the appeals of scholars to their intelligence, nor the reactions from readers in the pages of that same ZVYAZDA.

The position of nonacceptance and confrontation continues to prevail over intellect, to guide the actions of the leaders of this and certain other informal associations. It is precisely to these that they are proposing and want to marry off Belorussian youth as a whole. It is primarily this, probably, which makes it possible to explain that a recent document distributed by Talaka—an "Appeal to Belorussian Youth by the Initiative Group of the Confederation of Belorussian Associations"—invites all our young people into that same slough of world outlook and intellect into which Talaka itself has fallen. Moreover, they proposing to establish still another one, a so-called "confederation of Belorussian associations, within the closed circle they have created. Manifesting an obvious lack of modesty, representatives of Talaka and a number of other independent associations have begun with increasing frequency to speak out in the name of practically the entire youth of the republic, to present themselves as the sole supporters of Belorussian national history and culture, as the most consistent "fighters for restructuring."

With bitterness, it is necessary to acknowledge that all this is the result of deficiencies in child-raising within the family, the school, the Komsomol. As a result, instead of individuals characterized by civic activism, we are raising politically amorphous, socially infantile ignoramuses and chronic dependents, who criticize everybody and everything without sufficient arguments and evidence. They, themselves, view both the state and society in general as an inexhaustible milk cow or an unlimited warehouse and they endlessly demand "give me, give me, give me," while contributing almost nothing to the common cause.

Our mass information media are clearly working too little to correct these deformations within the world of youth. Through their joint efforts, the newspapers LITRATURA I MASTATSTVA and CHYRVONAYA ZMENA, the journal NEMAN, and certain other publications, have created a cheap popular picture of Talaka

and of Sovremennik, which, as readers can confirm, in no way corresponds to the actual state of affairs. Indiscriminate advertisement of certain of our informal associations benefits nobody.

Certain figures in literature and art also specialize in this. An article entitled "Look Around!", by the writer Ales' Adamovich, now living in Moscow, which was published in the journal OGONYOK, serves as a clear illustration. In this article, he succeeded not only in turning many things topsy turvy, but also in painting "labels" on those who, in his opinion, personify a "serious barrier to restructuring."

These "labels" are by no means inoffensive things.

Having practiced his hand on personalities, having become proficient at the verbal execution of persons that do not suit him, Adamovich moved on to larger targets—to the armed forces of the USSR, to entire regions and cities. What is the cost, let us say, of his assertion that, allegedly, the city of Minsk has deserved "in recent times the sad reputation of a bastion of opposition to restructuring?" What would you want the more than a million and a half residents of Minsk to do now, how should they "cleanse themselves" of the "labels" that have been painted on them? This question, in particular, was raised at a recent plenum of the Belorussian CP Central Committee.

Yes, we know what Ales' Adamovich in his day represented as a department head at the BSSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Literature. He then moved on to a more prestigious position—that of director of the All-Union Institute of Motion Picture Arts. The one thing that we cannot understand is how, while living constantly in Moscow, making countless trips abroad, attending all thinkable and unthinkable committees and councils, he has succeeded in providing, in an off-hand way, "deep" evaluations of ideological work as a whole within Minsk and the republic. Evidently, "the depraved telephone" and rumors reaching him from "writers" in Talaka have come to his rescue.

Unlike this "venerable" writer who has failed to see the common demagoguery of the leaders of Talaka, the wide-circulation INTEGRAL has assessed them correctly. In an article, "United by a Common Striving," it writes with justification: "Our young 'anti-Stalinists' are beginning to pin new labels and to break with the party apparatus concerning small matters, without having a precise and realistic program of action, to substitute form for substance, to shake their fists after the fight is over, and to propose plans which are difficult to carry out, without at the same time sharing responsibility for their implementation. The impression is being created that they are already infected by the 'virus' of bureaucratism, although they have not yet obtained any kind of real power."

There is no denying that, for some, the process of destruction is frequently more impressive and attractive than the process of creation. Here you have the "juicy", indelible epithets, the comparisons and metaphors which disintegrate opponents on the spot; here you also have such increasingly popular means of active non-acceptance as hooting, whistling and foot-stomping. Against this background, the process of creation sometimes looks insignificant and modest. But it is specifically in this that the essence of the restructuring that is taking place in our country lies. The time of clamorous meetings, of hysterical demagogic speeches, of endless debate about wording, and of "stormy applause turning into ovation" has now passed, rejected by the people themselves. The turn of fruitful thought, constructive decisions, and concrete, deliberate actions has come. Today, this is a nationwide, fundamental program that will help us to avoid many misfortunes and mistakes in the future.

Clubs Viewed as Obstructing Perestroika
18000205b Minsk, SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA
in Russian 27 Oct 88 p 4

[Excerpts from an article by BELTA correspondents V. Levin and B. Tarasevich: "Froth on the Wave of Restructuring"]

[Excerpts] Events coincided in such a way that on a single day we had occasion to attend two events for youth. In the morning, young people working in industry, agriculture and everyday services gathered for a conference in the Belorussian Komsomol Central Committee. Discussion was about what is new in life, what has been painful, what is being handled poorly and what is not being handled at all. Behind each word there sounded a concern about how things are going, about how to resolve the food problem, how to put more goods and products on the shelves, how to expand the sphere of services, and about what is keeping things from moving ahead, about what is restraining the initiative of the young. [passage omitted]

But there are people who, on the wave of restructuring, are not building, who are not tilling, but who rather are slyly bandying sophistries about, dissembling, playing with trifles, stirring up the froth which is being thrown up by the surf of renewal.

...The second meeting took place on the same Saturday, 22 October, at the Minsk City house of political enlightenment. The Sovremennik political club was holding a meeting. The topic presented for discussion was: "Freedom of the Individual, Choice and Elections."

What is there to say? A timely question, all the more so because, this same day, the draft law "On Changes and Amendments to the Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the USSR" was published.

The meeting organized by Sovremennik was attended as well by activists from Talaka. The club's chairman, L. Krivitskiy, announced that, in the course of the upcoming discussion, proposals would be worked out which the "informalists" will hand to BSSR Supreme Soviet deputies as a mandate for the forthcoming session.

But, instead of a businesslike consideration of this question, the chairman of Sovremennik and his assistant, A. Galkevich, opened the discussion with an open provocation by declaring that a "Popular Front Organizational Committee" had been established within the republic, which would supposedly unite all the informalists.

A legitimate question followed from the hall:

"Against whom is the "popular front" deployed?" Does it represent the people?

In response to this reasonable remark, the director of Sovremennik, banging with his fist on the table, declared:

"There are many people here who have been specially sent. I ask them to leave the hall."

So much for pluralism of opinions! This is how the chairman of Sovremennik views democracy. If you do not agree, get out. What is this, if not crude dictation to the audience, of people's will?

In the words of L. Krivitskiy, the political program of the club which he directs envisages implementation of all the decisions put forward by the 19th Party Conference, on one hand, and of the "innovative ideas of Sovremennik's Marxist social scientists," on the other. But, if this is so, then one can ask why the club finds necessary the atmosphere of conspiracy and secrecy in which it conducts its own work? The text of its "Program" was typed in a total of five copies and was distributed among the members of the Sovremennik council. We will not try to guess how information about this document leaked out to the audience. But Lev Vulfovich is certain that "his" people could not permit such "treachery..."

Whom do the members of the club represent? Nobody but themselves. The presence in it of two workers gives Sovremennik its basis for presuming that it "represents" broad strata of the working classes. V. Litvyakov, a metal worker at the plant imeni Oktyabrskaya Revolutsiya, characterized this delusion as follows:

"Within the labor collectives, they do not know and do not understand what the representatives of Talaka and Sovremennik want... As far as I understand, they want to be transformed into a popular front. I assume that the informalists consider only themselves to be the people... From today, forthwith, I have come to realize that I cannot not follow the well-known informal organizations—with their endless political demagoguery and extremism, they are boring and they distract us from

specific, vital problems... And I want to ask another question: "Why are discussions, if there is a need for them today, being organized at the initiative of some kind of Sovremennik, and not by party and Komsomol committees?"

One of us was sitting right on the steps of the stage, where a group of Sovremennik representatives had taken up position. One had to see the malice and arrogance present on their faces when this worker descended from the tribune. "Commie", "filthy Bolshevik", "dumb cattle..."—muttered these well-groomed youth, who obviously had no concept of ethics, of culture. It is difficult to comment upon such heckling, except by bewilderment; it evokes nothing. There is just one thing we would like to know: If it is not with people like Litvyakov—who, besides the fact that he speaks well, works even better at his machine tool—that restructuring should be accomplished, then with whom?

And one more observation as an aside. The leader of the discussion, L. Krivitskiy, asked each person who got into line to use the microphone to clarify for whom he intended to speak. It turns out that the organizers of the discussion had secretly divided the auditorium up into two fronts: "He who is not with us is against us." ...It seems we have heard that somewhere before.

The program documents of the club were not made public at the meeting but, judging from the addresses of the speakers, Sovremennik is pushing for a return to private ownership of the land and is importunately reactivating time-worn Menshevik, SR, and other slogans which have already been evaluated and rejected by history.

After this, it is difficult to detect what is Marxist about this group which, along with Talaka, pretends to the role of leader of a "popular front."

The workers and the scholars present in the hall gave a deserved and convincing rebuke to these newly-appeared claimants to speak in the name of the people.

"I am a working man," said metal worker and tool-maker at the special tool and technological equipment plant, chairman of the collective labor council of the Minsk Tractor Plant imeni Lenin association and deputy to the BSSR Supreme Soviet, A. Sharanovich. "We resolve all the social questions of our collective together, in a collegial way. This is entrusted to us by the people. And we have sufficient authority to cope with our tasks, without prompting from Sovremennik, Talaka, and other groups which do not represent anybody."

"Your proclamations, meetings, clamorous gatherings are hindering people from carrying out practical work for the renewal of life. You what to substitute words and demagoguery for deeds, to cast a spell on restructuring," said A. Sergeyev, an adjuster at the Integral production association, who, according to his own words, is both a

worker and a student at the same time. "And it is my understanding that we are being pushed into creating an organization which would place itself in opposition to the party and the people. I will only trust a club that consists of 70 percent workers."

"What is this 'popular front' which Talaka, Sovremennik and the others with them are forming?", S. Sergeyev asked the audience. In his opinion, it will be neither national nor popular. This is a group of people, and only that, who, judging by their declarations, are dragging us toward nationalism, toward feuds between nationalities. They are calling not for consolidation of the forces of restructuring, but for their disunity. Is this really to the benefit of restructuring? And does this really fit in with the spirit of the 19th All Union Party Conference? No. Stay as far away as possible from such a "front!"

The deputy director for training and educational work at the city Professional and Technical School No. 72, V. Shtefskiy, said:

"So, Leonid Zubarev has spoken here in the name of the informalists. He now calls himself a writer (incidentally, many leaders of the informal groups call themselves writers or sociologists; it as a good sound—the authors). Who is this "writer," if I may ask? We know him well; he worked at the professional and technical school... There was at one time a satirical article about him in the newspaper VECHERNIY MINSK under the eloquent heading 'The Moonlighter from the Band.' He used to survive by playing at weddings and he was involved in foreign currency operations. Now Zubarev is trying to become first violin with the 'informalists'.

"Recently, we had visitors to our school—the "Dreams" and the "Tone-Setter" bands appeared, along with a group called from Grodno called "Local Time", which nobody had heard of. There were also young people from Talaka moving about. When the adolescents had become numbed from the soul-shaking din, a young man appeared on the stage and started to wave a white-red-white flag—the symbol of the Belorussian bourgeois nationalists. And soloists intoned: 'War—the Hunt' and 'You're behind barbed wire', and they repeated this many times. After the so-called "concert", the teachers at the school carried out buckets-full of empty vodka bottles. This is how young people are being infused with the spirit of extremism; this how symbols foreign to our society are being introduced. (About the flag, they later, as always, hypocritically said that this is sport-related, a completely innocent thing, a trifle.)

As if by chance, innocently, but blatantly and warlike. And what is it worth doing about this? It is worth thinking deeply about it. We think that true democracy is learned not at such "concerts" as that which the "informalists" arranged at the construction professional and technical school. They are shouting at every crossroads

about freedoms, but are themselves thrusting their own delusions upon the young. With this, they tear microphones from hands and shout that they are clamping down on them.

The first deputy chairman of the administration of the Belorussian cultural fund, L. Valyayev, took the floor:

"Making reference to our social organization, a proposal has been heard here regarding establishment of a "popular front." It is necessary to make things clear. When, in June, the weekly LITARATURA I MASTATSVIA published an article about the Kuropats, the historical memorial commission of the Belorussian cultural fund moved into action. The question of creating a committee concerned with uncovering the victims of Stalinism was discussed at its meetings. But a government commission was soon established. However, for some people, this did not seem to be enough. Essentially, they disassociated themselves from the commission and began to work to establish their own so-called "Committee-58." The presidium of the administration of the Belorussian cultural fund decided to regard the establishment of this committee as inexpedient, taking into account that a governmental commission, which included authoritative specialists, was engaged with these same questions. There were no grounds to distrust it. But, as subsequent events (the 19 October meeting in the House of Film) showed, the "Committee-58" was needed not so much to uncover and perpetrate the memory of victims of Stalinism as to serve as a "cover" for the creation of a so-called "organizational committee" of a "popular front." At this meeting, in my opinion, there was no democracy. The addresses by the proponents of Talaka took place to stormy ovation, and any other point of view was whistled down. There was no hint of pluralism of opinion here. Everything followed the dictates of the "informalists". Fellows from Talaka even tried to use force, to "politely" conduct their opponents from the tribune. Is this really democracy? It is, in fact, anarchy. In a word, everything was as it was in the worst of the old times.

...We will not reiterate all the addresses, the course of the entire meeting. It went on for a full four hours. Here, too, they tried to drown speakers out with whistles and the stomping of feet, to drive them from the tribune. Respect for one another, a learned ability to listen—how frequently these are lacking in the participants in similar discussions!

It is obvious that the activists of Talaka and Sovremennik, while playing at politics, are propagating demagoguery and empty talk. What is not understandable is why they provide them with enormous auditoriums at their first demand. Why are their samizdat declarations, proclamations, and calls being secretly disseminated and passed from hand to hand? Who provided these informalists, who specialize in social demagoguery, an auditorium for youth and duplicating equipment? Why, as M. Vishnevskaya, a plasterer at MPOID, N. Buriy, a worker at the medical

maintenance plant, and M. Zukovskiy, the chairman of the city veterans' council, confirmed in their addresses, do they not have a clear idea within the labor collectives of just what the informalists and those who encourage them want? And they want a single thing: to be in view and, as one of the workers said, "to make a wave and hang noodles on our ears."

...When we now return in our thoughts to the hall at the house of political enlightenment, we unwillingly also ask ourselves questions such as the following: Why did not a single Komsomol worker take the microphone? Where, if not in such discussions, are they going to gain authority and to take initiative into their own hands? Why were the addresses of certain scholars and teachers at higher education institutions not very convincing?

Answers are still needed to many questions.

Following a proposal by lathe operator at State Bearing Plant No. 11, Hero of Socialist Labor S. Avsiyevich, the meeting passed a resolution which comes out against establishment of the proposed organizations and which expressed a lack of confidence in the organizational committee of the "popular front", having termed it incompetent and invalid. The meeting condemned the anti-democratic and irresponsible actions of individual persons and independent groups, which have set themselves up as fighters in the name of the people but which, in fact, have introduced chaos and uncertainty into people's lives. The resolution states: "We demand that the leadership of the republic and local organs of Soviet power call the presumptuous pretenders to order. Enough of irresponsible slogans! Enough of empty chatter and clamorous meetings! It is time to move restructuring ahead by means of deeds!"

There are no simple questions in restructuring. This has been once again confirmed by the two meetings at which we were present on Saturday.

Latvian Front Organizations Discussed

Popular Front Officials' Salaries
18000266a Riga SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH
in Russian 2 Nov 88 p 4

[Article by Olga Avdevich: "Whom Does the Latvian Popular Front Pay and How Much?"]

[Text] "Have you heard that all members of the Popular Front Duma will now get easy money?"

"And the chairman has been authorized a salary of up to R1,000!"

"It is said that they will have access, like regular bureaucrats, to various special privileges...."

And the rumors began to spread....

The surest weapon against rumors is reliable information. So the list of staff and salaries were established at the first session of the Latvian Popular Front Duma. The full-time chairman will receive R600, the executive secretary, R500, the two senior advisers, R300 each, five advisers, R250 each, the leader of the legal office, R300, the legal adviser, R250, the editor of the Latvian Popular Front newspaper, R250, the office chief, R300, the chief accountant, R300, two typists, R150 each, the cashier, R150, the clerk-secretary, R150, and the commercial director, R350. Nineteen persons all told.

Currently this list of staff and the salaries exist only on paper. Only the executive secretary has taken up her duties, but she is not receiving wages as yet. So the entire work is being performed on a voluntary basis. The question immediately arises: from what resources will wages be credited to the staff of the Latvian Popular Front, after all, the Popular Front receives only voluntary contributions from private individuals and organizations.

"It should not be thought that we will be hanging around the necks of the rank and file of the Popular Front," Sandra Kalniyte, executive secretary of the Latvian Popular Front, explained. "We will in time organize business activity. For a start we will produce our own symbols. The competition for the best emblem design will close in a month, and then we will be able to get down to business. In addition, we hope that our newspaper will generate considerable income."

Kezbers Addresses Plenum of Creative Unions
18000266a Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
4 Nov 88 p 3

[LATINFORM report: "Plenum of the Creative Unions"]

[Text] A joint plenum of the boards of the creative unions of the Latvian SSR, which discussed topical questions of perestroika in the republic, was held on 3 November in Riga, in the republic Palace of Culture and Art. The plenum was addressed by Ya. Dripe, executive secretary of the Creative Unions' Cultural Council, Doctor of Legal Sciences Yu. Boyars, assistant professor of the P. Stuchka Latvian State University, A. Teykmanis, judge of the people's court of Riga's Kirovskiy Rayon, M. Chaklays, chief editor of the newspaper LITERATURA UN MAKSLA, S. Kalniyte, executive secretary of the Latvian Popular Front, P. Petersons, secretary of the LaSSR Theatrical Union Board, A. Klotinsh, secretary of the republic Composers Union Board, the poetess V. Belshevitsa, Academician Ya. Stradyn, the film critic A. Kletskin, film producer Ya. Streych, G. Asaris, chief architect of the city of Riga, and others—26 persons in all.

The speakers discussed the drafts of the USSR law on changes and amendments to the USSR Constitution (Basic Law) and the USSR law on elections of people's

deputies of the USSR and spoke of the political situation in the republic and the creative unions' tasks in an acceleration of the process of perestroika.

The plenum was addressed by I.Ya. Kezbers, secretary of the Latvian CP Central Committee. Speaking of the cooperation of the Central Committee, the Creative Unions' Cultural Council, the Popular Front and other of our organizations, he expressed the profound belief that all are partners in the business of perestroika. But partners should be honest and scrupulous. And partners should understand that compromises need to be made for it is impossible today to achieve and actually specify all that we wish to achieve without reasonable compromise within the framework of the policy of our process of perestroika.

The speaker agreed with a number of participants in the plenum that there had been a certain haste in the discussion of the new bills. As you know, I.Ya. Kezbers said, we want next year to conduct real elections and are really preparing for the legal basis to have been formulated prior to the elections to the USSR and republic supreme soviets.

I.Ya. Kezbers went on to say:

"An assessment, negative, in the main, calling in question the Interfront has been heard here. In order to judge something or other one needs to know about it. I have not seen detailed documents of this organization, which is as yet just being set up. Therefore I cannot say what its program, goals and positions are. I would very much like to meet representatives of the International Workers Front for I believe that any healthy forces which support perestroika should come together. How many such fronts could there be? It seems to me that we should now unite in a single—labor—front. We need to have done with the go-round of leaflets and meetings.

"We should be giving very serious thought to international relations in the course of the highly interesting, complex process of perestroika and the democratization of our country. We are returning to Lenin, to Leninist party standards. And we must today regard anew and rely on Leninism on the question of inter-nation relations also. I wish to say that this is a creative process. And I call upon all of you, creative people, to participate in this work. I believe that discussion of the drafts pertaining to an improvement in the constitution and the elaboration of laws on language and citizenship need to be carried out on a sound professional basis, competently and, what is most important, without causing offense. We must understand that we live in a multinational republic. In a republic where there is a unique situation, and we cannot compare ourselves with Estonia and Lithuania, however much we would like to. Whatever pages of history unite the destiny of our peoples, a situation has taken shape with us today which is not identical to theirs, and we need to take stock of these realities for all politics is the art of considering realities.

Concluding my speech, I would like to say that I support the idea of the convening of a forum of the peoples. It is better to discuss and debate many aspects since the increased complexity of inter-nation relations at this stage demands clarity of position and thought and, what is most important, the preservation of precision and high-mindedness, after all, we need to continue to create our Soviet Latvia all together.

The plenum adopted a number of resolutions.

Reader Defends Interfront From Critics

18000266a Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
5 Nov 88 p 3

[Article by Engineer A. Fedoseyev: "Marching Together"]

[Text] I have read in the newspaper yet another letter of a worried man, in this case Prof Ya. Poriyetis. I cannot remain silent and consider it my duty to respond to this unwarranted, I believe, alarm.

Articles have begun to appear with increasing frequency recently, the burden of which has been aimed against the formation of a new social movement called the "International Workers Front of Soviet Latvia". Nonexistent pronouncements and nonexistent actions are being ascribed to the movement's organizers. And it is difficult ridding oneself of the feeling that everything is being done to discredit this movement in the eyes of the public and the republic government. Slogans are being dragged up from somewhere or other to the effect that it will introduce division or has already done so.

Take an unbiased look, comrades! Who is introducing what division? Where and in what do you see it? The Interfront does not have its own program yet, and there have only been a few short speeches and a debate with representatives of the Latvian Popular Front on television. What was reprehensible in this debate? The fact that it lifted the tension from all of us? The spokesmen for the two social movements showed us that contentious issues can be tackled and that in fact the goals and tasks of all of us are identical.

I believe that in the future both these movements will merge and will represent a single movement of Soviet Latvia's working people for perestroyka. Why has this frightened some people? I read closely what was published on the speeches of Interfront representatives. I read, I admit, and tried to see things through the eyes of the other side. And, believe me, I did not find in a single line a hint even of any imaginary division or hidden disrespect for anyone. And I am amazed, to say the least, that all this could be perceived otherwise. That some authors, literally examining in a microscope each comma in the text of the communications coming from the Interfront, do not see or do not wish to see the wordy writings of representatives of groupings of the "Helsinki" and "Environmental Protection Club" type

and other, in my opinion, extremist organizations is another matter. Yet their "open letters" appear every day near the Liberty Monument and are, you will agree, mainly of an inflammatory nature. And for some reason or other they alone may hang in the city center what they wish. Why is no one saying a word against them? Nor is it clear what the attitude of the Popular Front, of which they are members, toward this is. I believe that your words, Prof Ya. Poriyetis, and those of your colleagues would help them end this activity and join in the process of perestroyka.

It seems to me that everyone is free to decide which social organization to join, and which not. And this hardly needs pointing out to anyone. Before and after its congress the Popular Front kept its doors wide open to everyone. This is a fact. Anyone may enter these doors, but not everyone does. And it would be more correct, in my view, to attempt to understand why many people do not wish to do so, and not point out which doors may be entered, and which not. Let people look into things themselves. It is good that the newspapers are publishing polar opinions, including those of the opponents of perestroyka. I believe that any mature individual will understand what is at times concealed behind fine and elegant words.

I believe that the International Front of Workers of Soviet Latvia movement should exist. It is introducing no division in anyone's ranks. If the dark glasses are removed and one looks around, it is not difficult to see who is in fact driving in a wedge and where. Much is being written currently about the tense inter-nation relations. But did not a sharp exacerbation thereof occur following the constituent congress of the Latvian Popular Front? Following the demagogic appeals heard there? Even in the speeches of such well-known cultural figures in the republic as Khariy Liyepinsh, Imant Kalninsh and Albert Bels. And, perhaps, those who are sincerely concerned for tranquillity in the republic should be speaking just as sincerely about the tone and thrust of the said speeches.

It seems odd to me, I must confess, to hear a protest against the Interfront on the part of figures of the Latvian Popular Front, who, it seemed to me, should only have rejoiced in the creation of another movement for perestroyka, and not used all available methods to discredit this new movement. Is it not clear that the Interfront is not aimed against either the Latvian Popular Front or any groups of the population? I personally assumed that Latvian Popular Front figures would help the new movement get on its feet and help it with advice, after all, the Interfront is, for all that, on the initial path that the Latvian Popular Front was once on. But instead we are having to listen to tape recordings of meetings of individual groups of the international movement and watch televised fragments, selected none too objectively, and are learning about rejected versions of Interfront appeals, which do not belong to it but which are presented as valuable documents.

It seems to me that we all need to view reality soberly and impartially. I hope that commonsense will prevail even in the hotheads who are today using their influence to stop the Interfront movement by any means.

I would very much like Comrade Ya. Poriyetis to read my letter. I wish him success in the field of the Latvian Popular Front. After all, you will agree, far more unites us than divides us. Consequently, it is a question of finding a common way toward the common goal and getting down to practical work together.

Helsinki-86 Leader Accused of 'Working for Foreign Countries'

18000236 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
16 Nov 88 p 4

[Article by K. Pakaln: "Only Facts, Only Arguments; Documental Variations on the Topic of the 'Helsinki-86' Group"]

[Text] Several months ago—on 24 July of this year—the leader of the "Helsinki-86" group, Yuris Vidinsh, sent a letter to Jack Matlock, ambassador of the United States of America in Moscow. This specific fact may not necessarily deserve public discussion. Yet already on 27 July the text of the letter was reported by the Munich FREE EUROPE. Therefore, we now have the legal right to examine this document. Among other things, Yuris Vidinsh wrote the following to Jack Matlock:

"Today the decisive moment has come for the Latvian people. We have no more strength to break our backs under the banner of the occupational power of Russia, whose oppressive shadow has stretched over us for 48 years now."

"...Dear Mr. Ambassador! If you, the representative to Moscow of the world's mightiest country, would consider it possible to continue your defense of the enslaved peoples of the Prebaltic, including the Latvian people, to help them in their unequal struggle for restoration of independence, your support would be of inestimable value. May God help you in your full responsibility to your work!"

About a month later—on 30 August of this year—at the meeting of the Club for Environmental Protection which was being held in the Riga park "Arkadiya", Yuris Vidinsh pronounced the following words:

"I would like to tell you how my meeting of 25 August with the U.S. ambassador in Moscow, Mr. Matlock, went. First of all, I would like to note that the initiative on holding the meeting did not emanate from our group. The ambassador himself wanted to meet with me. I believe this due to the fact that Reagan's invitation (to meet with the president of the USA during his visit to Moscow—Ed-in-chief) was not forwarded to me, and

only one representative was sent from Latvia. Evidently, in order to compensate for this in some way, Mr. Matlock invited me personally".

And a bit farther:

"I have informed the ambassador about the meeting held on 23 August of this year in Riga. I gave him a complete tape recording of what was said there. After this I once again repeated to him the demands of the 'Helsinki-86' group."

The subsequent discussion with the U.S. ambassador in Moscow turned to problems of various types of extremism in Latvia. However, it is characteristic that it was not Yuris Vidinsh who spoke out against extremism, but rather Jack Matlock. We will quote a recount of this fact by Yuris Vidinsh in full, retaining, of course, the peculiarities of the author's speech:

"According to the supposition of the 'Helsinki-86' group, if the ruling elite in their hard-headedness will continue their former policy of prohibitions and repressions, there may be extremist attacks. I base the point of departure for this on the fact that certain people who were not satisfied with our activity addressed the group. As they said, it [our activity] is too mild. It must be much more active, even with extremist attacks. After this it became apparent that this evoked great dissatisfaction on his part (Jack Matlock—ed-in-chief) that such a movement might arise here. He compared it with the Palestinian terrorists, when many innocent people suffer, which in any case is unacceptable. He said that a struggle is senseless if a small group speaks out against everyone, and that then the outcome of the struggle is predetermined. This is a great absurdity, and he does not support it under any circumstances".

Now let us see how the newspaper LAYKS ("Time") which is published in New York reacts to the events in Latvia. In this year's 3 September issue, Gunars Meyeroovits, deputy chairman of the governing board of the Association of Free Latvians of the World (AFLW) writes:

"Never have our central organizations headed by the Association of Free Latvians of the World had such a sacred and important task as we do now—to morally and materially support the aspirations of the Latvian national groups in Latvia, those such as 'Helsinki-86', for example, as well as the Movement for National Independence of Latvia, the Club for Environmental Protection, and others. We have established ties with the leaders of these groups, who need funds and support for their activity."

"The time has come for each of us to understand the seriousness of this position. Therefore, we must support the Latvian freedom fund, with the aid of which the AFLW is performing work in the name of Latvian independence and the freedom of the Latvian people".

This same theme is continued by the poet Andriys Eglitis in the 12 September issue of BRIVA LATVIYA ("Free Latvia"), which is published in the Federative Republic of Germany. In the front-page article of this issue entitled "We Must Help Before It is Too Late", Andreys Eglitis stresses:

"Wake up, you people who have become entangled in the confusion of organizational standards. We too need our own reformulation, our own 'perestroika', our new courage in striving to liberate our homeland. We are part of the people who have been forcefully driven out by the authorities. We are not immigrants. We must include ourselves in such political work which will give strength to the fighters in our homeland. We must strive to raise the struggle for liberation in the occupied Baltic states as an international problem. We must help before it is too late, since we cannot help merely with a "song-and-dance" or by the singing of glorious songs by famous guests who have graciously come from the Homeland".

Today we have come to the topic of certain material benefits which foreign well-wishers have paid to the "Helsinki-86" group for its political activity in Latvia. Pursuing the discussion of money, let us take a closer look at one interesting document—the letter by Roland Silaraups which was sent to Latvia from the USA and addressed to one of the activists of this group's the Riga section. This letter was read publicly at the meeting held at the Freedom monument. Moreover, it was published in issue No 6 of INFORMATSIONNIY VESTNIK of the Latvian Independent Information Agency and duplicated copies were passed out at the meetings of informal organizations.

Rolands Silaraups, born in 1965, last year asked for and received permission to go abroad. Prior to this he worked actively in the "Helsinki-86" group. At the present time he has taken up residence in the United States of America. It is quite notable that Rolands Silaraups, like many other Latvians who have gone to live abroad at various times and for various reasons, exhibiting the stubbornness and energy inherent in this people, spared no efforts to acclimatize himself to the new conditions. Therefore, it was with unconcealed satisfaction that I read the following words in his letter, which was written on 4 August in California, and later published in INFORMATSIONNIY VESTNIK:

"All the time I am attending English language courses, and working. I have to earn money in order to finally make something of myself. I don't like having to depend on someone else".

In the fall of last year, the Association of Free Latvians of the World (AFLW) awarded an honorarium to the "Helsinki-86" group—a considerable sum of money. Rolands Silaraups writes about this in his letter to Latvia:

"At the beginning of this year it (the honorarium—ed-in-chief) was equally divided between 11 members of the group, who played the primary role in last year's events. Some of them are already in the West. The honorarium divided in March was sent to (...) Tomson, Biteniyetse, Baris and Ziyemelis. Then also [it was given] to all the group members who are still in Latvia. Yanis Rozhkalns undertook the task of delivering the money. I myself am a witness to the fact that Yanis gave the money to a 'courier', who was ordered to give it directly to Vidinsh, since he was at that time a representative of the group. He in turn had to pass it out to all of you (whom I have listed). Moreover, I have known the 'courier' personally for a long time. He is a remarkable person who has helped us many times. So there cannot be any suspicions about him. Moreover, we also received information in return that everything had been delivered".

Did the former and current members of the "Helsinki-86" group mentioned in the letter really get this money? This, unfortunately, we do not know. Maybe after this publication they will themselves inform the editorial staff and the readers of our newspaper. That is, of course, if they want to do so.

As it turns out, the above-mentioned monetary honorarium of the Association of Free Latvians of the World which was awarded to the "Helsinki-86" group in November of last year is not the only sum. Both in the broadcasts of "Voice of America" and "Radio Free Europe", and in the press publications of Latvians living abroad there were repeated reports that, after becoming established abroad, Rolands Silaraups visited many Latvian centers in several foreign countries. During all these visits he collected donations. Yet here too things did not go without complications, arguments and bitter resentment. Rolands Silaraups speaks openly of this in his letter:

"Today our work is to a certain degree limited. That is why the aid does not come in. For a year I have made every effort to obtain it, despite all the obstacles posed by the AFLW. And I was able to succeed in this, I might add, with a rather impressive sum—\$50,000. And, when everything was all ready to help ALL OF YOU (underscored by R. Silaraups—ed-in-chief), at the last moment, thanks to Grantinsh, and probably also Vidinsh, they took this sum out of our hands. This was partially my fault, but I could not imagine that this time our own people would bite us, and so basely at that—from the back. For this entire year I spared no effort to do this, and in return from Latvia I now receive blasphemy, lies and slander behind my back. There remains practically only one single means to obtain this sum. I can file a claim in a United States court against the AFLW. I have consulted with many jurists who have explained that I will definitely win the case. I have exercised this option for the sake of general peace. Therefore, there is no use in your waiting for aid today..."

And somewhat later in the same letter he wrote:

"...Not everything is yet lost. Even though my strength is waning I will not give up and will continue my fight to the end. I have various things in mind on what to do to improve the situation! I will do what I can".

This truly complex question requires some clarification. The Association of Free Latvians of the World, evidently unsure of whether last year's honorarium was really received in Latvia by all the addressees, has placed a hold on the above-mentioned \$50,000 until the situation has been clarified. And, after all, we can understand the AFLW. Both accuracy and trust really are needed in monetary matters.

Now we will continue to quote from the letter of Roland Silaraups:

"...One thing I have learned—not to pin my hopes on Latvians from the West. They are not as we imagined them. It is almost useless to expect aid from them. There are, of course, individual exceptions. However, on the whole—especially the Latvian organizations have become completely ossified, bureaucratized, and even angry. They are only interested in stewing in their own juices and in playing at being statesmen. I also became bitterly disenchanted with Gunar Mayerovits. He is the complete opposite of his honest father—Zigfried, who did so much to help our people. It is a pity. The Americans too would also help Latvia much more if the Latvians themselves did so. But to them, evidently, this is not important".

On 7 October the newspaper LITERATURA UN MAKSLA published an excerpt from the Latvian paper CHIKAGAS ZINYAS ("Chicago News"), which is published abroad. A conversation with Roland Silaraups appeared in the January (1988) issue of this small newspaper. Let us quote from it:

"Silaraups: A choir visited America, and one-third of its members were cheka agents. They received American dollars, but in counterbalance to this the "Helsinki-86" group and the Movement for Latvian Independence in general did not receive even a cent. It turns out that the Latvians in exile who supported the visit of "Ave sol" are sooner willing to pay money to the Latvian cheka than to the Movement for Latvian Independence. I heard that the visit of this choir cost the community in exile around \$100,000. If this \$100,000 could be sent to the "Helsinki-86" group in Latvia, then we could perform at least 5 times more work than before".

Now let us leave the financial activity aside and touch upon certain other aspects. International business deals, as we know, cannot be concluded unilaterally in today's world. Obviously, it can never be anywhere that one only

gives, while another only takes. In this sense there must necessarily be mutual equilibrium, since ultimately the time comes when the one who takes must give something in return.

In the summer of this year, a Swedish citizen of Latvian origin, Mara Strautmane, visited Riga. On 27 August she set out on her return trip through Tallinn. At the port of Tallinn the customs officials found 374 photo negatives, 53 photographs, various letters, video cassettes, and several printed works in Mara Strautmane's luggage. The Estonian customs officials, who did not speak Latvian, temporarily impounded these items in accordance with the law, so that they could consult with their Riga colleagues. It turned out that the materials being brought out to Sweden by Mara Strautmane could be used to make a detailed and precise overview of all the demonstrations, manifestations, meetings and other actions which were held the past summer in Riga. Understandably, these materials were not flattering to us. However, this is not reason to confiscate them and forbid their export abroad. Therefore, Mara Strautmane will get them back in good condition and in their entirety. We will hope that the foreign community is really interested in the events taking place in Latvia. And nothing more.

Continuing the topic of international correspondence, I would also like to mention the following fact. Last summer, U.S. citizen Vitauts Simanis visited Latvia. Riga customs officials discovered that he was bringing in 48 membership cards printed in Latvian and English to the members of the "Helsinki-86" group, as well as a new seal of this organization. I cite this fact not to bait and reproach. After all, we all are well aware of the capacities of our press, and therefore may be sure that the membership cards printed abroad will be more attractive, stronger, and more effective.

Today we speak out for closer cooperation of the Latvians living abroad with their people in the Homeland. We are in favor of contacts in the most varied spheres—not only in culture and art, but also in economics. It is a pity that large or small obstacles still appear in the path of mutual understanding and cooperation. To a certain degree they are felt by us, as well as in the West. Thus, an article by Karlis Shtamers entitled "For What Latvia is Communist Peters Fighting?" appeared in issue No 94 of the newspaper BRIVA LATVIYA, published in the FRG. In it, we read the following lines, borrowed from the repertoire of the "cold war":

"The position of the Latvian people in exile, as well as those living in occupied Latvia, is completely clear. Every Latvian communist, regardless of how he is called, is the enemy of our people".

The author of this essay is responding to the article by Ya. Peters entitled "For Popular Socialism, for a Legal State", published on 26 July in PADOMYU YAU-NATNE. In essence, he does not respond to, but rather-

demagogically attacks the author. And the unknown-Karlis Shtamers concludes his essay in BRIVA LATVIYA as follows:

"We might mention that once Imant Leshinskis said about Ya. Peters that he, like I. Ziyedonis, is a member of the cheka."

"Yanis Peters wants nothing other than an independent province of Latvia within the framework of the USSR—the great killer of men."

"In this respect, at least for now, we are at odds with him".

Out of respect for Yanis Peters, I will refrain from quoting BRIVA LATVIYA any further. However, let us listen to the words of the leader of the "Helsinki-86" group, Yuris Vidinsh, which were recently broadcast by "Voice of America":

"Being in the ranks of the Latvian Communist Party for 16 years, I became convinced that it is difficult to call this formation a party... If Gorbachev characterizes the current processes as a continuation of the revolution of 1917, then, as a result of any revolution, there must be a change of power. The change of power is necessary for the party in order to allow it to make a cardinal transformation. If it will not be able to do this, it will have to leave the stage. The 'Helsinki-86' group supports both possibilities and will do everything possible to see that this will happen".

How do the thoughts of Yuris Vidinsh differ from the attacks of BRIVA LATVIYA on Yanis Peters?

In a private conversation, one of the leaders of the "Helsinki-86" group's Riga section, who asked to remain anonymous, said:

"Yuris Vidinsh cannot say anything different. After all, he works 'for those abroad'."

This is probably true. Unfortunately.

Editorial Criticizes Call for Republic Sovereignty
18000210a Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
11 Oct 88 p 1

[Editorial report: "Responsibility for One's Actions"]

[Text] The yellow-green-red historic national flag was raised over an ancient turret of Gediminas Castle. Those who were on the square at that moment could not help sense the way the many thousands of people felt the same rush of emotion, and were of the same mind. The depth of feelings were expressed in both joyous smiles and tears, which the men did not hold back...

Political events—and raising the historic national flag is precisely a political event—today are coming one after another with kaleidoscopic rapidity. We must accustom ourselves to such a tempo, and master it. After decades of stagnation, not only in the economy but in intellectual and political life, not all people will succeed in doing so.

And, of course, one must also approach such a slow process with understanding, without impulsiveness and irritation. Familiar concepts are being abruptly upset; the complacency of the past is disappearing forever: it is being hung with red crepe, through which many have tried to discern and analyze reality. This complacency is being replaced by pungent, audacious ideas, and by decisive actions. Moreover, these ideas are far from uniform; they vary widely, and at times are even diametrically opposed. And the actions are far from uniform. Pluralism of opinions and actions are filling our lives with new streams of unrest, and with the desire to accelerate perestroika and make it irreversible.

Therefore it is especially important to be able to consider and distinguish between conflicting opinions; to understand what is directed for the good, for the development of socialism, and what is an obstacle and a hindrance to it. No one today has the right to pretend to have the truth in the final instance. Everyone has the right to be honestly mistaken, and in error. And the level of our democracy and glasnost will indeed serve as a certain guarantee that mistaken decisions will not be taken hastily, and that there will not be intransigence in errors.

I think that everyone who takes part in perestroika, and every thinking person, should develop a special affinity for the ancient aphorism, which Karl Marx considered his favorite motto: "Call everything into question."

Doubts were also expressed with respect to the colors of the flag, which on the volition of the Lithuanian people was raised over the ancient castle turret in Vilnius. These doubts were expressed in different ways, both decisively and carefully. But the right to decide in the given circumstances belongs only to the people. And the decision has come to pass.

At present all citizens of Soviet Lithuania, regardless of national origin, approach with interest and support fuller economic and political independence for the republic. In letters to the editor, however, there were also expressions of alarm, that this might lead to withdrawal from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Such fears might be considered groundless, were it not for overt or veiled agitation for this step in certain publications and TV broadcasts. The demand for separation was expressed decisively at meetings of the so-called "League for Free Lithuania," and is expressed in placards outlining its position.

These demands were often backed up by out-of-context quotations from the works of Vladimir Ilich Lenin on the

nationalities question. Here we encounter gross distortion of Lenin's ideas: "...We are for the RIGHT of separation (but not FOR SEPARATION of all!)—as Vladimir Ilich unswervingly stressed: "Separation is not at all our plan. We are in no way preaching separation. In general we are opposed to separation." One could cite a simple analogy. We have the right to divorce. But obviously we would be taken for a person without morals, if we were to agitate for mass divorce, and the break-up of all family groups. But you see, policemen's clubs are not the best argument to pound this simple truth into the hotheads.

Political discussion must not eschew critical, difficult questions. Indeed, the right of any nation to freely depart from the union of states is written in the USSR Constitution. And V.I. Lenin affirmed, that "...the recognition of self-determination is sincere only when a socialist of EVERY nation demands the free separation of nations, oppressed by his nation." And it is especially important that the representatives of the Russian people and others who live and work in Lithuania understand this. One might be offended by and not agree with the terms "occupation," or "colonization" of Lithuania, with which certain historians and commentators are now characterizing the events of 1939-1940, and the command-pressure management policy of recent decades. And such disagreement is probably justified. Because it was not the Russian people, who have always truly tried to render help, and did so, in the liberation and development of the Lithuanian economy; nor were the Russian people responsible for the mass repressions which distorted socialist legality and democracy. But one must admit that not all the Russians and representatives of other nations who have come to the republic have born and continue to bear the ideals of socialism, and respect for the unique national traits and culture of the Lithuanian people; for we are obliged to feel guilt for that, and we do. It is precisely such a confession that must serve as a stimulus for more energetic and active participation in perestroika in Lithuania, and for strengthening the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"We must," as Lithuanian SSR People's Poet A. Maldonis said in his speech at the 13th Lithuanian CP Central Committee Plenum, "have self-control and political maturity. Only these are able to unite the will of all the citizens of the republic, and put an end to irresponsible words and actions."

LiSSR Plenum Resolution on Restructuring Primary Party Organizations

*18000210b Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
16 Oct 88 pp 1, 3*

[Report: "Resolution of the CPLi Central Committee Plenum: On Restructuring the Work of Primary Party Organizations in the Light of the Political Instructions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference and the July 1988 CPSU Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] 1. Having heard and discussed the report of Lithuanian CP Central Committee First Secretary Comrade R.I.

Songayla, the Lithuanian CP Central Committee Plenum acknowledges that certain positive tendencies have been noted in the life of the primary party organizations in the republic. Democratic principles are affirmed in their activities, and there has been more glasnost and more business-like activity. The influence of the lower party links is increasing in manufacturing, in the socio-cultural sphere, and in socio-political life.

At the same time the plenum deems it necessary to stress that perestroika has not yet profoundly touched the style and methods of work of the primary party organizations. A significant number of them are not taking up active offensive positions; they are behaving sluggishly, and they have not made the transition from verbal support of perestroika to energetic actions. Many communists have not shown themselves to be genuine political battlers for perestroika; they remain passive in the face of difficulties, and they ignore the many negative phenomena and incidents.

This situation has come to pass because the Central Committee Buro, the secretaries and apparatus of the Central Committee, and many party gorkoms and raykoms have not yet drawn the proper conclusions from the political instructions of the 19th Party Conference; they have not always critically examined the political and economic situation in the republic; and they frequently ignore the serious shortcomings in the work of the primary party organizations.

The Plenum notes that the Lithuanian CP Central Committee and the party committees have devoted little attention to the work of primary party organizations at schools, VUZes and tekhnikums; scientific institutions and organizations; creative societies; and the mass information media.

2. The Lithuanian CP Central Committee Plenum attributes principal significance to the present reporting and election campaign in the matter of practical realization of the instructions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

Party gorkoms and raykoms, and primary party organizations, must make an in-depth analysis of the pace of perestroika in every working collective, rayon, and city; they must take a self-critical and principled approach to evaluating the style and methods of the activities of the elective organs during the reporting period; and they must work out the optimal program of actions. They must ensure that every party organization is in fact the political nucleus of the working collective; that it takes the lead in them of the process of renovation; that it provides creative impetus to the people; and that in all its activity it mobilizes them for successful execution of the resolutions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference and the July 1988 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

The elections for the leading party organizations and all links are to be conducted in such a manner, that they will be filled with truly active and enterprising people—who are capable of bringing quality to party work, not only in words, but in deeds. They must constantly be concerned about raising the prestige of the secretaries of primary shop party organizations and party group organizations; perfecting their training, and equipping them with the experience for working under the new conditions.

3. Stressing the direct connection between the militance of primary party organizations and selection and acceptance in the CPSU, the plenum notes that many party committee and party buros are not seeking new forms and methods of work in preparing to fill the party ranks, that they are not properly taking into consideration the peculiarities of the present stage of development of the party and society, nor the changes that have occurred in the people's consciousness. Acceptance to the party this year has on the whole declined by 18 percent in comparison with the same period last year, and for workers by one-fourth. Nor is the necessary concern being shown for party and political tempering of communists. At times principled analysis is not made on communists who have violated party discipline and the norms of intraparty life.

Republic party committees must increase the leading role and the activeness of the communists, and must strive to ensure that they become genuine political battlers, and organizers of the masses, distinguished by their creative labor and the unity of words and deeds.

4. The Lithuanian CP Central Committee Plenum noted that the primary party organizations are not yet devoting sufficient energy toward introducing new approaches in cadre work. Questions of selection and posting of cadres are quire often resolved without the active participation of party organizations; and, they are not sufficiently demanding with respect to increasing personal responsibility of cadres for the the sector of work entrusted to them.

The plenum believes that it is necessary to make in-depth changes to increase the role of the primary party organizations in questions of selection and posting of cadres at all levels, and to organize matters in such a way that all work with cadres would effectively serve party-political support for perestroika. They must actively support and nominate for leadership positions genuinely talented, questing people, capable of managing affairs in a new way. The norm of cadre work must be openness, and democratic selection of cadres for leadership positions, with maximum breadth of discussion of their candidature in party organizations and working collectives. Principled evaluations must be made of leaders who display irresponsibility, who take a tolerant attitude toward shortcomings, who are prone to substitute ostentation for deeds, and who flout the norms of socialist morality.

5. The plenum believes that the most important task for the party, soviet and economic organs at the contemporary stage is activization of work on restructuring the management of the economy, transition of enterprises of all branches of the national economy as well as scientific organizations to total cost accounting and self-financing; and ensuring strict compliance with the tenets of the laws of the USSR on the State Enterprise (or Associations) and on cooperation.

Primary party organizations should take under unremitting party control the fulfillment of contracts on delivery of products; of plans for introducing new technology, for renewal and improving the quality of products; of tasks for economizing on raw materials, fuel and energy. They must decisively strive to overcome the situations in which questions of supplying the public with food, housing, consumer, goods and serves are not being resolved satisfactorily.

Party committees and organizations must make fundamental changes in their attitude toward protecting the environment. Ecological problems must become one of the most important constituent parts of plans for economic and social development of cities and regions, enterprises and organizations, and plans for educational work with the people.

6. The Lithuanian CP Central Committee Plenum stressed the special urgency of decisively intensifying and increasing the effectiveness of ideological work of party organizations in the conditions of today's socio-political situation. It is necessary to steadfastly improve ideological-educational and propaganda work; to wholly subordinate it to the tasks of perestroika; and to teach the party aktiv and the ideological cadres to skillfully conduct ideological-political work in the new conditions. It is necessary to present well-reasoned explanations to the people on questions which arise among them, and decisively rebuff those people who manifest an alien morality, apolitical attitudes, and social demagogu.

The Lithuanian CP Central Committee Buro, party gorkoms and raykoms must fundamentally restructure the system of patriotic and international education in order that it functions in close interaction with the practical decisions on socio-economic, cultural, ecological and other problems which touch upon the interests of people of all nationalities. New approaches must be sought to the formation of healthy national feelings among the people, and high standards of international intercourse. At the same time the changes taking place in national self-awareness must be considered, as well as the complexity and contradictions in national problems and their direct connection with other aspects of social life, and activation of nationalistically-minded people in the republic.

Organs of state power and state administration must become more active in resolving questions connected with restoring the historical and cultural values of the Lithuanian people in the public life of the republic. They

must by all means implement the principle of equality of all the peoples who dwell in the Lithuanian SSR, and of their languages. Every assistance must be given to existing social associations for cooperation of Polish, Belorussian, Jewish, and Karaite cultures, and others; to satisfy their specific national-cultural interests and needs, and to increase their cultural activeness.

The Lithuanian CP Central Committee Buro must be given the mission to discuss at an expanded session questions of the political situation in the republic, the cultural-historical symbolism of the Lithuanian people, as well as the status of the Lithuanian and Russian languages in the Lithuanian SSR. The ideological commission of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee, together with scholars, specialists and the Lithuanian Movement for Perestroyka, must prepare a program for resolving national problems in the republic and make proposals to the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on questions of improving international relations.

7. Party committees are obliged to continually improve their leadership of the activity of all social organizations. They must take pains to assure that their day-by-day work is closely tied-in with the solution of vitally important problems, and that it more fully reflects the interests of the workers. They must find a means for interacting and genuine cooperation with the groups of the Lithuanian Movement for Perestroyka, and involve their members in the solution of specific economic, social, ecological, and other tasks—retaining at the same time principled party positions on them.

Increasing demands must be made on communists who work in the trade unions and in the Komsomol, who are taking part in the activity of the Lithuanian Movement for Perestroyka and other unofficial public associations, and must present to them strict demands for undeviatingly upholding the party line on perestroyka.

8. The plenum requires that all communists working in the mass information media wage the struggle for perestroyka more boldly and more actively; that they reveal in-depth the complexity of the problems the party is trying to solve; that they avoid superficial estimations of the events, both in the past and in the present; that they do not permit inaccuracy; and that they speak from substantive political positions in elucidating all problems, and especially the party's nationalities policy. Criticism in the press should be objective, accurate, competent, and thoroughly reasoned. The activities of the primary party organs in all their aspects must be more broadly illuminated in the press.

9. The Lithuanian CP Central Committee Plenum requires that the Buro of the Central Committee and all party committees take exhaustive measures on restructuring the work of the primary party organizations in the spirit of the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

Official Report on 28 Sep Demonstrations Issued
18000210c Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
18 Oct 88 p 1

[Report: "In the Presidium of the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] On 17 October 1988, the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers, having thoroughly analyzed the materials of the government commission for examining complaints about the activities of certain persons during the unsanctioned meeting held 28 September 1988, notes that the "Free Lithuania League" is of an anti-Soviet turn of mind; and, in spite of a ban on the meeting and additional warnings, nevertheless made preparations on 28 September 1988 to hold the meeting in Vilnius, at Gediminas Square, in violation of the law. Therefore, the Internal Affairs Administration of the Vilnius Gorispolkom worked out an appropriate plan of measures for forestalling this unsanctioned meeting. The plan envisaged utilizing on 28 September troops at the disposal of the Vilnius Gorispolkom Internal Affairs Administration: a company of special-purpose police, a motorized sub-unit of internal troops, and other forces. On 27 September this plan was approved by Acting Minister of Internal Affairs M. Misyukonis, and the party and Soviet organs of Vilnius and the republic were informed of this.

The day before the meeting, the authorities preparing the measures were advised at the Internal Affairs Administration of the Vilnius Gorispolkom of its illegal character and the liability of its organizers. And nevertheless, the "Free Lithuania League" organized the meeting. Prior to this measure, Internal Affairs officials informed the assembled crowd via megaphone that the meeting was forbidden, and urged them to disperse. After the forces envisaged in the plan were employed, and the crowd was gradually pushed out of the square, the organizers began the meeting at the approaches to the square. While the measures were being taken to remove the organizers of the meeting from the assembly site, the police officials encountered resistance. Objects of various kinds flew out of the crowd, and they were vilified with various kinds of insults. In order to avoid more serious consequences from this conflict, at about 20:00 hours, upon instructions from the leadership of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the police forces were withdrawn. The activity of the militia officials to forestall the meeting, to include the special-purpose company, were then ended.

At this time, seven injured citizens and six injured militia officials had requested assistance and were sent for forensic medical examination. No physical injuries were discovered on two citizens and one militia official. The others had incurred mild physical injuries not entailing damage to their health. Criminal proceedings were instituted at the Vilnius City Procuracy.

At the same time the republic government, taking into consideration the conclusions on the commission, notes that inaccuracies were committed in the formulation of

the meeting ban. Moreover, the public was not informed by the mass information meeting of the ban. The use of special motorized subunits of internal forces for setting up barricades preventing access to Gediminas Square had its effect on the situation. It was taken into consideration that the Lithuanian SSR Procuracy had appealed to the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs with a request to conduct an official check of the legality of using special motorized subunits of internal troops.

The Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers expresses regrets with respect to the incident, and appeals to all citizens, social and state organizations of the republic to keep the peace and at the same time avoid such events in the future.

Khmelnitskiy Citizens Issued Gas Masks to Counter Air Pollution

*18300171a Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 15 Nov 88 p 4*

[Article by N. Barsegov: "Breathe Deeper"]

[Text] On the eve of the Day of the Tank Troops holiday, a joyful event has taken place in the city of Khmelnitskiy. Thousands of families that live in ecologically dangerous rayons within the city have received new GP-5 military gas mask systems. Our special correspondent has just returned from Kkmelnitskiy.

The crimson autumn, with all the colors of the rainbow, has faded from the trees and shrubbery of the ancient city. On the broad, patterned leaves of the maples and in the vineyards, the night cold is more and more noticeably leaving its frosty breath, which sparkles playfully and then melts in the first rays of the morning sun. People, animated and smiling, are hurrying to work. The poetry of everyday life breathes all around. And, once again, the genius-like poetic lines that I was lucky enough to have read on the visual propaganda board in the oblast civil defense staff come to mind:

In the morning you arise, to work you go.

You till, you fish, or you sow.

The important thing, is not how long you live—

But how much you have time to do!

But poetry—is poetry, while the prose of life has its own laws and its own strict logic, which says that, in order to do more, it is necessary to live longer. And in the present, new economic conditions of economic accountability and self-financing, when the maximum return, and consequently maximum viability, is demanded from each working unit, the question of prolonging the lives of the population becomes a by no means rhetorical one. It is precisely therefore that the city leadership, seriously

concerned by a harmful ecological situation, is engaged in developing and implementing a purposeful and long-term program called "Life Goes On."

It was specifically within the framework of this program, on the eve of the nationwide Day of the Tank Troops, that the first step was undertaken in Khmelnitskiy—the issuance, free of charge, of gas masks to the population.

True, not all residents of the city received these pre-holiday gifts—only those who are fortunate enough to live in the rayon that is under the heaviest gas attack—close by the meat combine. Because, in terms of people's health, the meat combine is one of the city's most harmful production units. More than this! As the chief of the Civil Defense staff in Khmelnitskaya Oblast, Colonel G. Shmatko and Lieutenant Colonel P. Kulish allowed to me, the meat combine is one of the most dangerous installations on a chemical plane, and it is for this reason that the oblast and city soviet executive committees made this decision.

As is known, doctors do not recommend that you eat meat, or fruit, vegetables, water melons and melons that are saturated with herbicides, or that you drink unboiled water and vodka, or that you smoke tobacco... But the human psyche is now already so structured that sometimes we still, well that there is no way can manage without all these things. And, no matter what kind of irreparable harm is done to our health, in this case by the meat from the Khmelnitskiy meat combine, we are nevertheless not strong enough to reject this wonderful product.

While I was still three kilometers from the entrance to the plant, my sense of smell detected specialized odors which, because I am not used to them, brought on a sharp attack of sea sickness. Local residents, born in the local atmosphere, have long since adapted to it and have even somewhat changed in appearance: They have, in particular, smaller and narrower nostrils than we have.

"Well, this how we live," the chief engineer of the meat combine, comrade L.P. Yaroshenko, cheerfully tells me. "We have gotten used to it. Our clothing, it is true, stinks and we have to change clothes all the time."

"In 1977, we got an expensive stainless steel unit for removing foul-smelling gasses," recalls meat combine worker P. Novik, "but, it was precisely in that period that the enterprise failed to meet its plan for scrap metal and it was necessary let it go for the noble cause."

Now, at the meat combine, they showed me a new installation of, according to my estimate, about 10 tons. For the time-being, it is lying, still packed up, in the middle of one of the meat combine's puddles filled with dirty, stinking swill. And I assume that if, during the fall rainy period, it does not disappear into the womb of the soggy earth, and if no particular scrap metal problems

come up at the meat combine in the next few years, then it is entirely possible that they will put this installation into operation as was really intended.

But, if we approach the problem from the state's viewpoint, from the point of view of the economy, then we will clearly see that the use of gas masks is a far more effective and less expansive measure for combatting pollution of the atmosphere than the installation of expensive purification units. This is understood not only by the leadership of the city, but also by the intelligent part of the population that has received gas masks. Somewhere in the countries of West Europe, wallowing in permissiveness and cynicism, a similar experiment might end up with the population, having donned these same gas masks and having inscribed various kinds of obscenities on placards, marching to the square, to the city officials or, even worse, no longer buying the production of this same meat combine and confronting it with inflation.

I can attest with full responsibility that such anarchy is not even close to being observed in the heads of that part of the population which I polled. People have reacted to this manifestation of concern for their health entirely deliberately and with an understanding of the matter. It seems to us that such experience might find broad application also in Nizhniy Tagil, Lemerov, and Cherepovets, in the well-known Moscow rayon of Brateyev, in the cities of Angarsk and Novokuznetsk... There are lots of rayons and regions in our country, the residents of which are more and more in need of protection against the air. Studying the experience of the residents of Khmelnitskiy, I have come to the conclusion that, in the near future, gas masks need to become just as necessary a personal attribute as are underwear, shoes, or haberdashery. There should be gas masks for men and for women, ones for everyday use, for holidays and for sports, for the theater, for weddings...in a word for all life's events. We think that, first of all, enterprising cooperatives should have a say here.

While telling about progressive experience, I unfortunately also cannot bypass certain negative facts that I noted in Khmelnitskiy, which relate to this initiative. No, it is not at all for the sake of the criticism that is so fashionable in the press, without which almost no newspaper report can manage, that I undertake this discussion—I do not want to see this advanced initiative, after becoming famous in a brief campaign, die away in embryonic form, as has happened more than once. And I have certain reasons to fear on its account. The fact is that, for some reason, despite explanatory work, the population is not demonstrating special enthusiasm in introducing the protective devices they have received into their daily lives. Come to Khmelnitskiy and you will see for yourself that there are practically no people wearing gas masks on the streets!

"Personally, my wife and I usually put on our gas masks at night, when we're lying in bed," V. Ukhvatov, a resident of one of the buildings on ulitsa Industrialnaya

admitted to me. "It's, well you know, somehow... On the street, we still haven't gotten accustomed," he added further. To make up for this, we have already gotten completely used to it at night and, I tell you, we now feel really excellent in the mornings!"

And, nevertheless, I would hope that the citizens of Khmelnitskiy will feel just as unfettered and at ease in their gas masks during the daytime as during the hours of darkness. It seems to me that here, first of all, the workers of the soviet executive committees and the trade union organizations and also, above all, party workers should set a personal example. The Komsomol should also not be the last one to have a say in this matter. You won't believe it, but some workers of the local Komsomol had heard only from me that their city is a pioneer in the gas mask movement.

To the program—an increased impetus!

Limnology Institute Director on Lake Baykal Pollution Issues

*18300171b Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 17 Nov 88 p 4*

[Interview with M.A. Grachev by journalist Yu. Makartsev; date and place of interview not specified]

[Text]"When will we finally celebrate the Day of Baykal's Salvation?"—this question has long since become a constant one in the mail of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. Our newspaper has been present at the outset of a powerful social movement in defense of the "holy sea." We have supported it with our publications. Now our readers are concerned about how the latest party and government decision concerning measures for the protection and rational utilization of the natural resources of Baykal, passed on 13 April of last year, are being carried out. "Protective certificates" were also previously issued for this unique body of water. However, all earlier decisions (which saw the light in 1969, 1971, and 1977) to a large extent remained nonobligatory documents for the ministries and departments.

Today, the director of the Limnology Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences Mikhail Aleksandrovich Grachev and journalist Yuriy Makartsev conduct a dialogue.

[Makartsev] Mikhail Aleksandrovich! In the struggle for a clean Baykal, the central press has for many years relied upon the opinion and position of the scholars of the Limnology Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department. Last year, the leadership of the Limnology Institute changed. There have been other changes... You yourself, it seems, have moved to Irkutsk from Novosibirsk?

[Grachev] I worked there in the Institute of Bioorganic Chemistry of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department, where I headed the laboratory of ultra-micro biochemistry. After 22 years of living in Novosibirsk, I had put down strong roots and even until recently had not thought about moving anywhere. A group of colleagues also moved to Irkutsk along with me in 1987. But, basically, I am a Muscovite in terms of my roots.

[Makartsev] Sometimes it is not easy to start a new job. In Irkutsk, they had a high opinion of the former director of the Limnology Institute, G. I. Galaziy. How have you been received here? I see, Mikhail Aleksandrovich, that your deputy, Yu. S. Kusner, is still living in his office...

[Grachev] Moscow also was not built in a day. I admit that I find it awkward to talk about the difficulties with our everyday life. Help has been promised to the staff members who have moved here and they are waiting patiently for an apartment.

All this time, I was acting chief of the Institute of Limnology [LIN]. Quite recently, in a election with secret balloting, I was chosen by the collective of the institute as director: 240 votes—"for" and 40—"against". Grigoriy Ivanovich Galaziy, incidentally, was also elected—as a member of the institute's scientific council.

[Makartsev] They say, Mikhail Aleksandrovich, that having become the chief of Baykal science, you have somewhat changed the course of the institute. I already heard about this in Moscow this winter. A clean sweep?

[Grachev] We think that we have become the heirs to many of the ideas of the former director of LIN. G.I. Galaziy is an unbending man. One of his services is that he came out against the philosophy of the MAC (maximum allowable concentrations) as a panacea in the struggle against growing environmental pollution. Incidentally, all water protection efforts in the USSR up until the present have been built upon this philosophy. At the same time, there has been no hurry to perfect production technology and the amount of the substances that are being dumped into bodies of water has grown.

[Makartsev] The MAC, specifically, have been the key-stone of research at the Institute of Ecological Toxicology (IET) of the USSR Ministry of Timber, Pulp, Paper and Wood Processing Industries [Minlesbumprom]. In 1986, when I came to Baykalsk, they invited me to the purification facility of the cellulose and paper combine. The director filled a ladle from the aeration pool and asked me to "drink down" a swallow of the industrial effluent which was destined to be discharged into Baykal. I drank it. And—I did not die. Why this ritual? They were trying to convince visitors to the combine that its MAC are the best in the country, the best in the world, and that the effluent from the combine is practically drinking water...

[Grachev] The industrial effluent of the Baykal Cellulose and Paper Combine [BTsBK] is in fact cleaner than the discharge waters of the cellulose industry in other countries. However, the consumption of water per ton of cellulose produced at the combine is much higher than world standards. Something else is even more important: They contain organic chlorine substances of categories which are particularly dangerous ecologically and which must not be discharged into Baykal. But let's return to the MAC. The development by researchers of a single standard of maximum allowable concentrations for just one substance costs the state almost 100,000 rubles. Not less than a year is required for this. About 60,000 classifications of organic substances are being used in industry. So, consider how much time would be needed to develop a whole "table of standards" and how much money this work would "suck out" of the state's pockets.

[Makartsev] The IET and the Institute of Limnology have looked at each other from opposite shores of Baykal and have occupied irreconcilable positions. How are the mutual relations of these two scientific institutions developing today?

[Grachev] Relations earlier, in fact, allowed room to hope for improvement; a confrontation existed. Whose fault was it? I think that we were both just as good. The figures which the IET has produced have been basically correct. But its philosophy is unacceptable for Baykal. The "MAC philosophy", however, is accepted even now throughout the entire country. We dispute this philosophy, but at the same time are also trying to establish cooperation. The IET has good experimental facilities (we have none) and its specialists have very high qualifications.

[Makartsev] Mikhail Aleksandrovich! Surely, when you took over management of the institute, poverty was peeking out around every corner? We have tried to ask a great deal from science, but have kept it in a "state of starvation". ... The press has reported that the capital-labor ratio within the system of the USSR Academy of Sciences is substantially lower than in transportation and in agriculture, not to mention industry. It is a real problem to purchase commonplace instruments for laboratories.

[Grachev] It is true that I am not growing fat... LIN has little equipment, its fleet is obsolete, and it does not have a kopeck in foreign exchange. We have decided that, in Baykal, we will develop methods of analytical chemistry and methods of biological control. This is what was earlier lacking in the activities of the Limnology Institute. First of all, we have begun to make wide use of "Milikhrom" chromatography in our work. Research on the "Milikhrom" which, incidentally, we have conducted together with Finnish scientists, has shown that intensive accumulations of dangerous organic chlorine substances occur in the livers of fish that kept in the

discharges of the BTsBK. We have yet to create a serious base for ecological research in our country. We are only at the beginning of this path...

[Makartsev] Mikhail Aleksandrovich! Standards have been issued for allowable influences on the ecological system of Lake Baykal. But where can these be obtained? Even the workers of those enterprises which, in the performance of their duties, are obligated to reduce discharges into the lake, to carry out the 1987 decision, still do not have this document. As if in the good old days, the standards have a stamp on them: : "FOU [DSP]—for official use. Are we again playing at secrecy on Baykal?

[Grachev] These standards are available to enterprises right now. However, I think that the stamp "FOU" should be removed from them and that they should be made generally available. What is the most important thing in the new Baykal concept of the Siberian scientists? Reducing the input of pollutants into the lake, gradually and in a planned way, so that during 1988-1995 all the industrial enterprises within the basin will be able to achieve the level of the best technologies in the world.

[Makartsev] The standards require that, now, every enterprise in the Baykal zone must have its own, personal ecological certificate [pasport]. What is this supposed to look like, Mikhail Aleksandrovich?

[Grachev] The ecological certificate contains a description of plans for cleaning up discharge waters and atmospheric emissions, and also a concrete plan of practical actions for reducing burdens on the environment. I think that the decree, with the exception of individual points, is capable of being fulfilled, if we are speaking not about the letter but about the spirit of its demands. Certain "letters" should be changed. Thus, fortunately, an ill-starred pipeline has been "scratched"—A discharge water line from the BTsBK into the Irkut River will not be built. Together with the Minlesprom, we will soon issue a series of proposals for correcting the tasks assigned by the decree of CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers in the interests both of protecting Baykal and of the state pocketbook.

[Makartsev] Mikhail Aleksandrovich! You have been more than once at the Baykal Cellulose and Paper Combine. In your view, what is the situation there today? Is the collective making preparations for re-profiling [pereprofilirovaniye]?

[Grachev] Today I can state firmly that the combine believes in re-profiling and is seriously making preparations for this. Our friends from the "Society to Protect Baykal" have circulated a questionnaire in Baykalsk. The following has been made clear: Those who do not want a change in profile are in the minority.

[Makartsev] A similar questionnaire should be also passed out among the management workers of the USSR Minlesprom! Why is the ministry planning to invest tens of millions of rubles on reconstruction of cellulose production at the BTsBK? Why is imported equipment arriving at the combine although soon, in 1993, production will halt? The people in Baykalsk cannot understand their leadership in Moscow. The scientists and the rank-and-file workers are alarmed: Work at the Ust-Ilimskii site, where it is planned to relocate cellulose production capacity, is developing slowly. What is the ministry hoping for? Society, the country's young people, are demanding that the combine shut down specifically in 1993, as stipulated by the Baykal decision.

[Grachev] A part of the equipment intended for the BTsBK could be sent even today to the cardboard combine in Selenginsk and to other plants within the sector. Now, together with Minlesprom, we are preparing appropriate official proposals. But let us not forget that the BTsBK is not the only problem. According to the decision, small facilities around Baykal will have to construct 92 purification installations. Although this is not easy, it can be done. And, under the slogan of saving the lake,... we stand to destroy it. According to the standards, it is forbidden to chlorinate discharge waters. According to the requirements of the USSR Ministry of Health—this is necessary.

[Makartsev] Are We testing things out on the run, are we experimenting on the clean water of Baykal? Here is still another mistake of ours in the years of stagnation: The Selenginsk combine produces the most simple kind of cardboard. Why was it placed on a tributary of Baykal? And why, for 17 years, have they clouded our minds with fairy tales about a closed system of water circulation which, judging from everything, is technologically impossible?

[Grachev] Yes, a system free of discharge in the Seleng, as it was conceived, probably will not be achieved. In the 1970's, the Americans tried to create a closed cycle in cellulose production, and nothing came of it. And, for all that, we are seeking a way out for Selenginsk.

Of course, the fact that the combine was located on a tributary of Baykal, the Seleng, was a mistake. The technical planning was done at the end of the 1950's, the equipment stood around for a long time in the street, in boxes—what you will, and it works poorly, especially for gas purification, where to achieve the world level is like reaching to the heavens. And, nevertheless, the scientists are inclined to the view that it is possible to manage without changing the profile of the Selenginsk Cellulose and Cardboard Combine [STsKK]. It will only be necessary to modernize its technology and to make it ecologically safe in terms of discharges. This enterprises uses lumber industry waste products as its basic raw materials—chips, twigs, below-standard lumber. To burn it is harmful to the economy and bad for nature.

[Makartsev] The costs of constructing a closed cycle at the STsKK were initially set at the sum of 7.05 million rubles. Today it is already planned to allocate 68.6 million rubles. All the nature protection measures on the Seleng will come to 150-200 million rubles. Re-profiling of the BTsBK, with the creation of compensating capacities in Ust-Ilimsk will cost about 2 billion. And plus modernization of small, technologically backward production facilities in the Baykal zone! We are not counting our money! Is the deputy chief engineer at STsKK, N.A. Aldokhin, not right when he says: "In terms of providing living space, children's pre-school institutions, hospitals, and clinics, the Buryatskaya ASSR holds the last places among the republics, krais, and oblasts in the country. Perhaps we should first build living space that is fit for humans? Existing purification units are primitive, the discharge standards which today have been established for Baykal will never be achieved using them." Mikhail Aleksandrovich! Isn't the new Baykal concept of the Siberian scientists just another bow to an cost [zatravnaya] economy and bad management? A new compromise?

[Grachev] Of course, in a certain sense, the new approach is a compromise "between the desirable and the economically possible." It is very bad, I think, that Baykal does not have juridical status...

[Makartsev] Do you think, Mikhail Aleksandrovich, that a special law concerning Baykal is needed?

[Grachev] Here is the kind of idea that seems decisive to us. The UNESCO member nations have approved a general structure for protecting the cultural and natural heritage in the form of a Convention which was passed at the UNESCO General Conference in November 1972. By the middle of 1987, this convention had been ratified by 95 countries, and the Worldwide Heritage List already contained 247 cultural and natural objects. The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has ratified the Convention and we have been participants in it since 1 January of last year.

[Makartsev] It would seem that our country has not been treated badly in terms of natural treasures... But, is it difficult to get into the "golden list"?

[Grachev] The Convention takes under its protection those natural treasures which have outstanding universal value for all of mankind.

[Makartsev] I understand you, Mikhail Aleksandrovich: You propose Baykal...

[Grachev] Yes, to include it in the list of world heritage parcels as number one from the USSR. Our great and greatly suffering Baykal! A nature conservation movement began here, one which has many followers today throughout the country and the entire world. This will be our common victory.

[Makartsev] A victory, Mikhail Aleksandrovich, is something that is not evident. For more than two decades we have been battling the departments with their obsolete technologies and the scientists who still dream of forcing Baykal "to work". The number of omul has declined and they themselves have decreased in weight. The nerpa are dying... We will not succeed in suddenly re-profiling the BTsBK, by 1993, the routine "objective" reasons will be found, and we will be disgraced, but this time on a worldwide scale.

[Grachev] The international level of protection is exactly what will allow our glorious sea to obtain the juridical status which it is lacking, on which we will be able to rely in our further nature conservation activities. What we are talking about here is our promise to the world community to preserve Baykal for the generations. There are no opponents to this idea. You are surprised: Even the workers of the combines of Minlesprom, as is shown by a survey conducted by the "Society to Protect Baykal", find it a wonderful one. It will be necessary to decide who will take into his own hands a "unified Baykal policy." Standards already demand, for example, protection of Baykal's landscapes—but nobody has yet seriously concerned themselves with this. There will of course be more bother, but more new possibilities will also appear. We will be able to rely on the authority of international science. However, many are concerned: Will the sovereignty of the USSR over Baykal not suffer? Is it worth bringing in foreigners? There is no loss of sovereignty. And what if we do not succeed in fulfilling our international obligations? They will cross our Baykal from the lists of outstanding natural objects, that's all! But, I think that we will not allow such a disgrace to happen.

[Makartsev] Perhaps then we will finally succeed in reexamining the "worth of Baykal," of returning to it that world-standard significance which it, in fact, deserves. In our battle for the lake's cleanliness, we have been lyric poets, romantics, didactics—nothing has come of it. Shall we be pragmatists? To work in a good way with the consumers of Baykal's water, in tune with our new ideas about restructuring, the economy, and economic accountability, dollars are needed. Well, in 1993, instead of cellulose production, we will have a furniture assembly plant here. Doesn't this mean that we will be breeding new problems which will again begin to "suck up" the money that is so necessary to the national economy, the social infrastructure, science, etc.?

[Grachev] One more thought. We would like to have an international ecological center at Baykal. The socio-economic justification for this is already being examined. The structure is as follows. The center will be directed by an international council of directors. It will select, on a competitive basis, draft research projects. Construction and current financing will be accomplished by the constituent countries. What benefits might we receive? Baykal will become a subject of research by international science. The newest scientific equipment

will appear here. Our scientists and engineers will also be able to make many proposals: These might involve original analytical instruments, satellite soundings, methods of molecular biology and genetic engineering, and much more.

[Makartsev] Will Listvyanka begin to speak in all languages? However, the old hulls of the Limnology Institute itself are not impressive. And will foreign researchers take the risk of setting out for a trip on Baykal on your present vessels?

[Grachev] Well, we will update the fleet. I will note, however, that our vessels, although they are not new, turn out to be the best lake-going scientific research

vessels in the world: This is the view of the American participants in three international expeditions carried out on Baykal this summer.

We need underwater apparatus, a new laboratory building with an isotope unit, aquariums for fish, nerpa, and invertebrates. We need a computer center, a building for a scientific library and a terminal for communication with world data banks. Cottages for our own and foreign scientists, where they could live during work on their projects (one to three years) with their families.

The idea of establishing a center is supported by many prominent scientists who have visited Baykal this year. In what way is the creation of such a center any worse than the idea of a joint flight to Mars?

22161

59

NTIS

ATTN: PROCESS 103

BEVERLY FARRADAY

5285 PORT ROYAL RD

SPRINGFIELD, VA

22161

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed, with personal and place names rendered in accordance with FBIS transliteration style.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source. Passages in boldface or italics are as published.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in eight volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications, which include approximately 50 regional, worldwide, and topical reports, generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically.

Current DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semimonthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be

provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013. Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.)

Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.